National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-58254-5

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN ALBERTA'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

BY

KATHRYN LOIS HUNT ©

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1989

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Kathryn Lois Hunt

TITLE OF THESIS: Curriculum Development and Program Delivery for English as a Second Language in Alberta's Elementary and Secondary Schools

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1989

Permission is hereby granted to the UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only. The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Kathryn L. Hunt

8460 - 118 Street
Edmonton, Alta. T6G 2T3

Date: June 13, 1989

Education is fundamental to every Albertan, but especially to our young people. We need to ensure they have the capacity and ability to embrace and shape the future. Our governments's priority on education is not a priority on preserving the past nor a priority on maintaining the status quo. It is a priority on ensuring that the education system provides students with a high quality education and prepares them well for the challenges they will face in the future.

(Nancy Betkowski, Minister of Education, Province of Alberta, January 8, 1988, p.1)

Luu Truong, a 12-year-old Vietnam born student who speaks Chinese, took extra classes last year at St. Basil's to help with his English. Like 50 per cent of the students at St. Basil's, he grew up speaking a language other than English.

This year, the English as a second language class is "pfft, gone" because of cutbacks, says principal Kevin Murphy.

When asked, Truong admits shyly, that he sometimes doesn't understand what his teachers say. He takes his questions home to his brother, who understands English a little better.

(Edmonton Journal, Thursday, November 5, 1987)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN ALBERTA'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS submitted by KATHRYN LOIS HUNT in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Douglas V. Parker
(Supervisor)

L. [illegible]

James [illegible]

[illegible] Hayden

Date: June 13, 1989.

To my husband Douglas

ABSTRACT

The main intent of this research was to collect descriptive data in the form of reports, perceptions and opinions of educators which would contribute to the development of a more comprehensive profile of English as a second language education in Alberta's elementary and secondary schools. Such information may prove extremely useful for educational planners involved in both curriculum development and program delivery for English as a second language.

The survey research method was employed to collect data through the use of a mail-out survey and personal interviews. The subjects chosen to participate in the mail-out survey were taken from the following population groups: ESL teachers, Non-ESL teachers, Special Education teachers, Principals, Superintendents, School counsellors, School psychologists, ESL consultants, and English Language Arts consultants. The personal interviews were conducted with various educators who had expertise in the field of English as a second language and who were employed with schools, universities, and the provincial government.

This research has generated information with regard to the following areas of concern; provincial level ESL curriculum development, local level ESL program delivery, the impact of funding policy on ESL programming, and teacher training and professional development for ESL. The major conclusions and recommendations regarding the improvement of English as a second language programming in Alberta can be summarized as follows:

1. Curricular materials and resources for teaching ESL students need to be made more accessible for Non-ESL staff.
2. All general subject area curriculum guides should incorporate ESL teaching suggestions.
3. Communication must be improved between ESL and Non-ESL staff, especially in rural areas where ESL support services are spread very thinly.
4. ESL Program and curriculum development should consider the needs of resident ESL students such as Hutterite and Native children.
5. Many teachers and other school staff lack the training and inservicing needed to prepare them to teach and support students with ESL needs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the financial assistance provided by the Language Services Branch of Alberta Education.

I would like to extend thanks to my committee members, Dr. Ruth Hayden, Dr. Larry Beauchamp, and Dr. James Patrie, for their valuable input and suggestions.

I wish to thank all those who participated as respondents, interviewees, and intermediaries for this research.

My gratitude is extended to Diane Wyllie, for her help and friendship.

I would especially like to thank Dr. Douglas Parker, my advisor, for his tremendous patience, help, and encouragement over the past two years.

To my mother, Lois Foster, I wish to express my appreciation for the way in which she has encouraged me in all my educational pursuits.

Finally, I want to thank my husband Douglas for his understanding and inspiration throughout the course of this research. His support was a constant source of strength and enabled me to bring this work to completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, AND DEFINITION OF TERMS.. 1

1.1 Introduction..............................

1.2 Purpose of Study.......................... 2

1.3 Definition of Terms...................... 4

1.4 Limitations............................... 6

II. BACKGROUND ISSUES AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE................................... 7

2.1 English as a second language programming in Alberta; 1980-87.....................

2.1.1 Initial Recognition and Planning..
2.1.2 Curricular Leadership............. 9
2.1.3 Provincial Curriculum and support Documents for ESL................. 13
2.1.4 The Funding Policy for ESL....... 15

2.2 Issues that Prompted an ESL Program Review.............................. 17

2.2.1 The Secondary Education Instructional Program Reveiw.... 18
2.2.2 Regional Office Zone Monitoring Reports........................ 20
2.2.3 Issues and Reccomendations in ESL Provided by an ESL Stakeholder Group............. 22

2.3 Review of the Literature........... 26

2.3.1 The ESL Funding Policy: Implications for Programming...
2.3.2 Directions in ESL Curriculum... 47
2.3.3 ESL Program Delivery Models.... 51
2.3.4 Teacher Preparation and Professional Development........

III. RESEARCH DESIGN.............................. 55

3.1 Research Questions..........................

3.2 Research Method............................. 57

3.2.1 General Study Procedure..............
3.2.2 The Mail-Out Survey.................. 58
3.2.3 Personal Interviews.................. 71

IV. DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND DISPLAY OF RESULTS.................................. 75

4.1 Data Collection and Analysis Procedure......

4.1.1 Data Collection Procedure.............
4.1.2 Data Analysis Procedure...............

4.2 Response Rate for Mail-Out Survey........... 76

4.3 Profile of Respondents for Mail-Out Survey...................................... 80

4.3.1 Urban and Rural Distribution of Mail-Out Survey Respondents..........
4.3.2 Grade Levels Taught by Mail-Out Survey Teachers..................... 82

4.4 Provincial Level ESL Curriculum Development................................. 84

4.4.1 Respondents' Opinions as to the Availability, Use, and Adequacy of Provincial Curricular Support Documents Courses, and Resources.......
4.4.2 ESL Curricular Support Documents and Course Manuals Recommended by Consultants.......................... 109
4.4.3 Type of Curricular Support Document Considered by Teachers and Consultants to be Most Needed....................... 111

4.5 Local Level ESL Program Delivery........... 115

4.5.1 Methods of ESL Program Delivery......
4.5.2 Superintendent Reports of ESL Program Operation..................... 118

4.5.3 Principal Reports of ESL Program Operation....................119
4.5.4 Consultant Services at the Local Level..............................
4.5.5 Primary Responsiblility for ESL Students in Schools....................126
4.5.6 Time Spent on Direct ESL Instruction in ESL Classes....................132
4.5.7 Availability of ESL Teachers in Schools....................134
4.5.8 Meeting the Special Needs of ESL Students....................136
4.5.9 ESL Instruction Through Content Area Study....................150

4.6 Data Relating to the Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming....................153

4.6.1 Respondent Reports on the Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming.......
4.6.2 Resident (Alberta Born) ESL Students....................156
4.6.3 Early Childhood Services and ESL........163

4.7 Teacher Training and Professional Development....................167

4.7.1 ESL Related Courses taken by Teachers....................170
4.7.2 ESL Inservice Attendance by Teachers..............................
4.7.3 Respondent Comments Regarding Teacher and Staff Preparation for ESL...............170

4.8 Personal Interview Results....................174

4.8.1 Provincial ESL Curriculum Development..............................
4.8.2 Local Level ESL Program Delivery....................177
4.8.3 Impact of Funding Policy on Programming....................178
4.8.4 Teacher Training and Professional Development for ESL....................180

4.9 Summary....................181

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.................... 183

5.1 Conclusions and Recommendations............ 184

5.1.1 Provincial Level Curriculum Development..........................
5.1.2 Local Level Program Delivery.......... 189
5.1.3 The Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming................... 198
5.1.4 Teacher Training and Professional Development.......................... 201

5.2 Changes that May have Improved this Study................................ 206

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research............ 210

5.4 Summary................................ 214

REFERENCES.. 216

APPENDIX A. TABLE A-1 AND TABLE A-2................ 222

APPENDIX B. ESLCCC MANDATE......................... 225

APPENDIX C. LETTER: FIVE YEAR PLAN.................. 227

APPENDIX D. ESLCCC FIVE YEAR PLAN................... 230

APPENDIX E. PILOT STUDY LETTER AND NOTE OF THANKS.... 234

APPENDIX F. TABLE F-1 AND F-2....................... 237

APPENDIX G. COPIES OF QUESTIONNAIRES................ 239

APPENDIX H. MAY 3 PRE-QUESTIONNAIRE LETTER........... 292

APPENDIX I. MAY 13 QUESTIONNAIRE LETTER.............. 294

APPENDIX J. JUNE 6 LETTER, FOLLOW-UP #1.............. 296

APPENDIX K. JUNE 10 LETTER, FOLLOW-UP #2............. 298

APPENDIX L. TABLE L-1............................... 300

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Number of Immigrants from 0-18 Arriving in Alberta in 1986	44
2	Rate of Questionnaire Return	78
3	Urban and Rural Distribution of Mail-Out Survey Samples	81
4	Grade Levels Taught by Teacher Sample Groups	83
5	Availability of ESL Documents and Manuals According to Principals	85
6	Teacher Evaluation of the Document "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs"	88
7	Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Using The Document "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organizatin of Programs"	89
8	Teacher Evaluation of the Document "ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions"	91
9	Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Using the Document "ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions"	92
10	Teacher Evaluation of the Document "ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions"	94
11	Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Using the Document "ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions"	95
12	Teacher Evaluation of ESL 10A, 10B, and 10C Course Manuals	97

13 Reasons Given by Teachers for not Using ESL 10A, 10B, and 10C Course Manuals 99

14 Use of Available ESL Resource Sources by ESL Teachers 101

15 Rating of Available ESL Resource Sources by ESL Teachers 102

16 Use of Available ESL Resource Sources by Non-ESL Teachers 104

17 Rating of Available ESL Resource Sources by Non-ESL Teachers 105

18 Use of Available ESL Resource Sources by Special Education Teachers 106

19 Rating of Available ESL Resource Sources by Special Education Teachers 107

20 ESL Documents Recommended by Consultants 110

21 Type of Curricular Support Documents Seen by Teachers and Consultants to be Most Needed 112

22 Methods of Program Delivery Used in Alberta Schools as Reported by Teachers and Principals 116

23 Availability and Estimated Use of ESL Consultant Services 121

24 Frequency of Requests Made to ESL Consultants by Various School Staff Members 125

25 Approximate Numbers of ESL Students for Whom ESL Consultants are Responsible 126

26 Majority of Language Support for ESL Students as reported by ESL and E/LA Consultants 128

27 Primary Responsibility for ESL Students in Schools as Reported by Principals 130

28 Average Number of Hours Per Week of Direct ESL Instruction as Reported by ESL Teachers 133

29 Availability of ESL Teachers in Schools as Reported by Non-ESL and Special Education Teachers 135

30 ESL Students Who have Missed Some Years of Schooling as Reported by ESL, Non-ESL, and Special Education Teachers 137

31 ESL Students Requiring/Receiving Special Education Services as Reported by ESL and Non-ESL Teachers 140

32 Special Education Teachers' Perceptions of Their Ability to Meet the Needs of ESL Students 142

33 ESL Students Requiring/Receiving Psychological Services as Reported by ESL and Non-ESL Teachers 145

34 ESL Students Referred to School Psychologists 146

35 School Psychologists' Perceptions of Their Ability to Help ESL Students 147

36 ESL Students Referred to School Counsellors 148

37 School Counsellors' Perceptions of Their Ability to Help ESL Students 149

38 Percentages of ESL Teachers Who Teach ESL Through Various Content Areas 151

39 Percentage of ESL Students and Those Born in Alberta 158

40 Courses Related to ESL and Taken by Teachers 168

41 Teacher Attendance at ESL Inservices 171

CHAPTER 1

1.1 Introduction

There are many factors which contribute to the complexity of educational programming for English as a Second Language (ESL) students in Canada. Burnaby summarized a number of these in an address to the Alberta Teachers of English as a Second Language conference in 1986:

> It is difficult to determine lines of responsibility for funding, teacher training and certification, administration, materials development, evaluation, and so on. When the jurisdictional situation is this complicated it is inevitable that there will be duplication of services, needs that are not met, programs whose aims are too broad to be practical, programs whose aims are too narrow to be cost effective, a shortage of appropriately trained teachers,...and so on (Burnaby, 1986, p. 23).

A comprehensive profile of the overall programming situation for English as a Second Language education in Alberta does not exist at present. At the moment, there is no single, organized body of information which can provide an accurate representation of the nature of provincial level curriculum development and local level program delivery for ESL in Alberta's elementary and secondary schools. The compilation of such a body of information, that is, an "ESL Programming Profile", is necessary if the problems summarized by Burnaby are to be addressed so as to ensure that ESL students in Alberta can enjoy equal opportunities in education.

One way of obtaining a fair and comprehensive description and evaluation of present programming would be to collect information from the individuals who are involved in offering ESL education. Their opinions are essential if we want to improve the curriculum development and program delivery systems for ESL.

1.2 The Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to contribute to a profile of ESL programming in Alberta. It will do so by obtaining the perspectives of educators, that is, those who administer ESL programs or may be immediately involved with teaching, assessing, or counselling, ESL students.

The general objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To collect data from educators which will provide new insight into the effectiveness of ESL curriculum

development and program delivery in Alberta's elementary and secondary schools, as well as how provincial policies appear to affect these processes.

2. To analyze the data collected and to isolate the major issues or areas of concern raised by those responsible for ESL in Alberta's schools.

3. To suggest ways in which improvements may be made to ESL policy and programming, based on the data collection and analysis as well as on the findings of other research in the field.

4. To provide suggestions for ways in which future studies could continue this line of research and contribute further to the development of a more complete profile of programming for ESL education in Alberta.

1.3 Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions apply.

1. ESL - English as a second language
2. TESL - Teaching English as a second language
3. ESD - English as a second dialect
4. ECS - Early Childhood Services, (Playschool and Kindergarten)
5. Native Canadians - Indigenous Canadian people, for example, people of Cree, Stoney, or Blackfoot descent
6. ESL Programming - Curriculum development and program delivery for ESL
7. ESL Curriculum Development - Curriculum for ESL developed by Alberta Education for use in elementary and secondary schools. This includes courses of study, with and without credit, curriculum support materials such as guidelines and suggestion manuals, and any documents listing resources for ESL
8. ESL Program Delivery - The manner in which an ESL program is delivered at the local level
9. ESL Program Delivery Methods - The methods or alternatives of ESL program delivery as listed and defined in the document "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the

Administration and Organization of Programs", that is; Reception Class, Partial Day Class, Withdrawal Program-ESL Resource Room, Withdrawal Program-Itinerant Teacher, Transitional Class, Support Program within the regular classroom, Bilingual Education Program, or any combinations or variations of these methods.

10. Provincial - Relating to or originating from Alberta Education

11. Local - Relating to or originating from local school boards

12. Urban - Communities with populations of 10,000 or more as indicated by the Province of Alberta (1987) Official Road Map

13. Rural - Communities with populations of less than 10,000 as indicated by the Province of Alberta (1987) Official Road Map

14. ESL Stakeholder Group - A group of individuals who have a stake of one sort or another in ESL education, for example, ESL students, their parents, and their teachers

15. L1 - The mother tongue, or first language that an individual acquires

16. L2 - The second language that an individual acquires

17. Resident ESL Students - Students with ESL needs who were born in the province of Alberta, for example, Native Canadians, Hutterites, children born to immigrant parents resident in Alberta.

1.4 Limitations

The following limitations apply:

1. This research reveals a view of ESL Programming in Alberta based on the reports, perceptions and opinions of some clearly identifiable ESL stakeholder groups, and not those of the population at large.

2. The results of this study will not be generalizable beyond the province of Alberta.

Certain issues concerning the results of past educational planning efforts for ESL Students in Alberta and elsewhere have been raised by various researchers and educational bodies. The following chapter provides an overview of some these issues as they relate to this investigation. Also included in the chapter is a description of the history of the development of ESL programming in the province of Alberta from 1980 to 1987, which will provide the background for this study.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 English as a Second Language Programming in Alberta: 1980 to 1987

2.1.1 Initial Recognition and Planning

In Canada, curriculum development and program delivery for ESL students differ from province to province. According to Wyatt (1982), each of the western provinces is unique in its responsiveness to the needs of ESL students. In 1980 official recognition was given to the presence of immigrant ESL children from kindergarten to grade twelve in Alberta and to their educational needs when David King, the Minister of Education at that time, stated that Alberta Education would begin taking initiative in the area of English as a Second Language (ESL) (Wyatt, 1982). In his address to the Second Annual Conference of Alberta Teachers of English as a Second Language (ATESL) on November 22, 1980, King outlined the following proposed changes and/or suggestions for English as a Second Language in Alberta:

- To transfer the responsibility for ESL to the Language Services Branch;
- To direct the Curriculum Policies Board to consider in consultation with interested parties the development of curriculum and curriculum resources for use in Alberta schools;
- To approve the distribution by the School Book Branch of ESL student materials at a 40% discount;
- To examine the method and the assistance which Alberta Education offers to ESL programs to aid local jurisdictions in the admininistration of their programs (eg. funding, special project funding through the Educational Opportunity Fund);
- To consider the possibility of hiring an ESL consultant for school jurisdictions outside of Edmonton and Calgary;
- To initiate discussion with the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower to assure a supply of competent teachers (Brunner, 1981, p.1).

Since that time there has been an attempt by Alberta Education to develop curricula and guidelines and suggestion manuals for ESL in order to help ESL students gain the linguistic, cultural, and academic skills necessary to enable them to benefit from general education programs.

2.1.2 Curricular Leadership

In 1981 the English as a Second Language Curriculum Co-ordinating Committee (ESLCCC) was formed and assigned the mandate of planning, developing, and piloting activities for programs and/or curiculum prepared for ESL students.

Specifically, the mandate consisted of the following:

- Identifying the needs of pupils in urban and rural school jurisdictions in Alberta as they relate to English as a second language;
- Establishing priorities for curricular activities on the basis of information obtained from the needs identified above;
- Reviewing proposed administrative guidelines for English as a second language to provide feedback to the Language Services Branch on the proposals;

- Assisting the Language Services Branch in preparing curricular guidelines for Alberta schools in which there are students learning English as a second language;
- Identifying other curricular issues and concerns and making apppropriate recommendations to the Curriculum Policies Board;
- Establishing and monitoring the work of English as a Second Language Ad Hoc and Learning Resources committees (ESLCCC File, 1981). (See Appendix B)

The ESLCCC was made up of teachers, administrators, consultants, and a university representative, all having expertise in the development of English as a second language curriculum (Bussiere, 1984). A five year plan for ESL was drafted by the committee in 1981. This plan was to address key issues including:

- Implementation of program components, i.e. in-service
- Development of resources for an orientation package for various educational audiences
- Development of a set of recommendations for Secondary Education institutions

- Accreditation of high school courses
- Identification and selection of learning resources
- Promotion of familiarity with ESL documents (see Appendix C) (May, 1981)

The ESLCCC was concerned with ensuring "that the ESL student will have access to the same educational opportunities available to other students" (see Appendix C). Two "statements of ideals" were adopted along with the five-year plan.

> Every school will accept an English as a Second Language/Dialect (ESL/D) student as an individual who is an integral member of its student body and adapt its programs to help each child reach his/her potential.
>
> Whatever language and culture a child brings to us is to be regarded as a positive and enriching factor benefitting the individual as well as the total school community.
> (See Appendix C)

The ESLCCC also stressed the important role that teacher attitude, knowledge, and skills play in the achievement of these ideals (see Appendix C).

By March of 1982 the ESLCCC had taken action with regard to the development of a philosophy for the ESL program, goals, and objectives of the ESL program, defining characteristics of language, and addressing issues in ESL acquisition and learning. This action formed the basis for the development of statements of intent for a proposed provincial document of administrative guidelines for establishing ESL instructional programs in rural and urban Alberta. A document entitled "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs" was developed in 1982 as a result of this initiative. The document contains directives and information with regard to the development and preparation of:

- a definition of the ESL student
- a statement of philosophy dealing with the education of ESL students
- a statement of goals and objectives for ESL programs
- a definition of an ESL program
- a description of program delivery alternatives including statements regarding the advantages

and disadvantages of each

- assessment procedures for entry into a school program, exit from an ESL program, and review of special cases
- procedures for reception and orientation of families, students, and staffs
- a role and responsibility statement for the ESL teacher, the regular classroom teacher, paraprofessionals in the ESL program, other support personnel, and community members (Brunner, 1981, p.1).

2.1.3 Provincial Curriculum and Support Documents for ESL

Since 1982, curricula for ESL have been developed at the provincial level. Guidelines and suggestion manuals as well as curriculum guides for accredited courses have been prepared. Descriptions of the intent of these documents and courses follow.

1. English as A Second Language 10A: Basic English, 1986, is a non-credit course designed to help students develop basic communication skills. It is intended for students who have no experience with spoken English or very limited experience. Students spend as much time in

ESL 10A as they require to achieve the course objectives.

2. English as a Second Language 10B: Language Development Across the Curriculum, 1986 is a five credit course designed to prepare students who are at an intermediate level of English language proficiency for studies in the content areas. The course is designed to help students succeed in high school subjects such as social studies, science and mathematics. Students normally enter ESL 10B upon completion of ESL 10A, or upon demonstrating that they have reached an equivalent level as a result of some other English language learning experience.

3. English as a Second Language 10C: An English Language and Literature Transition Course, 1986 is offered for five credits and is intended to meet the communication needs of ESL students who are at the intermediate to advanced level of English language proficiency. ESL 10C is appropriate for students who intend to pursue further studies in English language arts courses at the high school level. The course is intended to introduce the ESL student to English literature using the communication strands set down by the Alberta curriculum for language arts.

4. Elementary School Guidelines and Suggestions for English as a Second Language, 1987 are guidelines designed to supplement the Elementary Language Arts curriculum guide (Alberta Education, 1985) by describing "programming which provides opportunities for ESL students to learn the English language" (Alberta Education, 1987a, p.vii).

5. Junior High School Guidelines and Suggestions for English as a Second Language, 1988 is a document which was prepared as a reference to be used by teachers of ESL and teachers of language arts. Its purpose is to "describe approaches and techniques that will promote the language development of English as a Second Language students in the Junior high school" (Alberta Education, 1988, p.vii).

2.1.4 The Funding Policy for ESL

The ESL funding policy adopted by Alberta Education may influence ESL programming, in particular, the ways in which local school boards deal with the development and administration of programs.

The current policy for provision of funding for ESL in Alberta (Alberta Education, 1987) reads;

> Alberta Education will assist school boards in providing instructional programs for students who, having recently arrived in the province, require special assistance in learning English as a second language so that they can follow instruction in English (p.111-18).

The assistance mentioned above is allocated in the form of Language Program Grants (LPG) for ESL. For the school year September 1, 1988 to August 31, 1989 (Alberta Education 1988-89), the eligible school jusrisdictions in the province will be provided with $630.00 for each pupil served (p.5). This funding is in addition to the basic instructional per pupil grants of; $1830.00 (elementary), $1969.00 (junior high), and $2124.00 (high school), to be received by regular school boards for the same period (p.1).

Certain restrictions apply to the special assistance grants of $630.00 and are of importance with regard to their effect on the nature and quality of ESL program development and delivery at the local level. First, in order to be considered eligible for a Language Program Grant for ESL, a school board must be providing programs for ESL to pupils in grades 1-12. Second, those pupils enroled in such programs will only be allowed to receive funding for three school years, with the 1984-85 school year being the base year for determining eligibility.

The third, and possibly one of the most crucial constraints, is that of the cut-off date for grant applications. In any given school year, the "count date" for ESL grant application is September 30 (Alberta Education, 1986, p.1). It follows that ESL students arriving after this date would not be considered for the Language Program Grant.

The ramifications of this ESL funding policy are numerous and have not gone unnoticed by ESL stakeholder groups and other concerned educational bodies, as the following sections of this chapter illustrate.

2.2 Issues That Prompted an ESL Program Review

Since the time of the initial curriculum development and policy formulation for ESL in Alberta discussed above, issues have been raised regarding their relevancy and adequacy both by the Secondary Education Instructional Review Committee and by a number of specialists and ESL stakeholder groups.

Subsequently, a review of these issues prompted the Language Services Branch to reassess existing ESL programming and to begin the development of descriptions of the students from Early Childhood Education to grade 12 who may require ESL instruction. The following sections provide an overview of the range of issues in ESL, and in some cases, recommendations, as outlined by the above-mentioned groups.

2.2.1 The Secondary Education Instructional Program Review: Issues in ESL

In 1986 the Secondary Education Instructional Program Review for Language Arts (Alberta Education, 1987d) evaluated ESL programming in Alberta. Strengths and deficiencies of the following aspects of programming were assessed:

I. Intellectual Development
II. The Instructional Program
III. Fundamental Concepts; Skills and Attitudes
IV. Responsible Citizenship
V. Personal Values
VI. Student Needs and Ablities (pp.22-29)

Deficiencies were found to be present in three of the above categories (II, III, and VI), and the Secondary

Education Instructional Review Committee generated recommendations for future action with regard to each of the three areas. Based on review of the instructional program for ESL, the committee developed four recommendations:

- A program of studies is needed for ESL at the Elementary and Junior high levels.
- Clearer articulation is needed among the curriculum guides for ESL 10A, 10B, and 10C.
- More consistency of format relating to language and philosophy, statement of content, and organization in the curriculum guides for ESL 10A, 10B, and 10C is needed.
- The multicultural literature focus of ESL 10C could be enhanced through the provision of additional Canadian Content (p.37).

Two recommendations were made with regard to fundamental concepts, skills, and attitudes:

- Consideration should be given as to how technology can be used in the teaching of ESL.
- Consideration should be given to exploration of technological themes in ESL (p.37).

In terms of student needs and abilities, the committee provided one recommendation which stresses the need for ESL programming to meet the "range of special needs of ESL students" (Alberta Education, 1986, p.37,5). This range includes the special needs of ESL students who are gifted, severely multiply-handicapped, and/or illiterate in their mother tongue. It was suggested by the Committee that answers to the following two questions related to the issue of ESL special needs students be included in the philosophy statement for all ESL documents:

- How can the range of individual needs of a student's ability and background be accommodated?
- How will remedial and enrichment activities be developed and incorporated into the program? (P.29,)

2.2.2 Regional Office Zone Monitoring Reports: Recommendations for ESL

The Provincial Summary of Zone Monitoring Reports for Regional offices of Education (1986-87) provides concise directives and recommendations for ESL programming based on the results of program monitoring at the local level. The Summary of Monitoring results for ESL shows that programs in all six zones (Grande Prairie, Edmonton (Zone 2), Edmonton (Zone 3), Red Deer, Calgary, and Lethbridge) were monitored and recommendations relating to various aspects of programming were developed for submission to Alberta Education (Planning and Policy Secretariat, 1988) as follows:

- Adjust policy to allow for resident students (born in Alberta) requiring ESL programs.
- Clarify definition of an ESL student.
- Provide a basic grant which is not contingent upon the number of students being served.
- Update curricular and similar documents for each special needs area to match the Program Policy Manual.
- Improve communications with jurisdictions about program policy and grants manual.
- Reaffirm importance of monitoring as a component of the Management of Education Cycle (p. 43).

More specific recommendations for the Program Policy area of ESL resulted from a previous Regional Office Monitoring Summary Report and appear in a Status report for 1985-86, included in the 1988 Office Monitoring

Summary. The recommendations provided are:

- Do [ESL] pupil counts twice yearly.
- Extend the [ESL] program to native children.
- Review program policy in relation to [ESL] student needs.
- Review submission dates for grant claims to accommodate [ESL] students who enter at different periods (p.6).

2.2.3 Issues and Sugggestions Regarding ESL: Provided by an ESL Stakeholder Group

ESL teachers in Alberta possess specialized knowledge and experience gained through extensive contact with ESL students and their families. In addition, they often act in a consultative capacity, providing guidance and advice to their non-ESL colleagues who have ESL students in regular classrooms. ESL teachers are concerned with all aspects of growth and development of ESL students and are aware of the socio-emotional, academic, and language needs of this group. They have been involved in both planning and implementation of ESL curricula and programs in the province for a number of years.

A meeting held in November of 1987 between a Language

Services Branch representative and several ESL teachers from the Calgary Public Board of Education revealed some of the concerns held by this particular stakeholder group. The topics discussed included; a) the question of levels of proficiency for ESL, b) the need for ESL support at the ECS level, c) the need for support for ESL students born in Alberta, d) the nature of curriculum for ESL, e) the special needs of ESL students, f) the need for an ESL consultant at the provincial level (Kingwell, 1987).

Although the issues mentioned above were not stated as recommendations, Kingwell's (1987) summary provided reasons for the suggestions that formed the basis of the discussion.

It was suggested that the levels of proficiency for ESL need to be defined such that ESL students would, in the end, be prepared to function in the regular, academic program. The need for the determination of levels of proficiency to be based more on academic language requirements instead of those of a social nature was also mentioned.

In terms of the nature of curriculum for ESL, the teachers indicated that they favoured a language-based curriculum which is not "exclusive of other curricular requirements and content" at the elementary level (p.2).

At the junior high levels cross-province consistency in entrance and exit requirements, gaps in previous education, and the problem of assessment were among the issues raised. It was stated that there is a need for curricular guidelines for junior high ESL and guidelines for ESL teaching in the content areas. The possibility of introducing a junior high option of transitional ESL was also discussed.

The issue of gaps in previous education also appeared in statements concerning the special needs of all ESL students (Kingwell, 1987). These "needs which go beyond language needs" included "culture shock, trauma resulting from refugee camps and/or war experiences, [and] lack of stable family support" as well (p.3).

It was suggested that at the high school level, consideration be given to providing credits for ESL 10A (currently a non-credit course) for reasons of consistency. It was also remarked that the time allottment for ESL 10B and 10C was "unrealistically low for what is required for ESL" (p.3).

The Summary also referred to the need for certain ESL student groups who do not currently qualify for ESL funding to be considered for financial assistance and consequently, programming. ECS students who require ESL instruction and sometimes need to repeat kindergarten but are not allowed to do so were mentioned, as well as ESL students who are born in Alberta but receive no assistance because of their place of birth (Kingwell, 1987).

The proposal that there is a need to appoint an ESL consultant at the provincial level was said to be justified by the "numbers and complexity of ESL needs" (p.3).

The above summary of ESL teacher concerns echoes many of the issues that were raised by the Secondary Education Instructional Review Committee and in the Regional Office Zone Monitoring Reports. A number of these issues and their impact on programming for ESL are explored further in the following review of the literature.

2.3 Review of the Literature

Since the number and complexity of the issues that were highlighted by the sources cited earlier make it impossible for this research to cover all of the questions raised, this study will focus on the following major areas of concern:

- ESL Funding Policy
- Directions for Curriculum in ESL
- Teacher Training and Professional Development.

Each of the following sections deals with one of those categories and the way in which the issues involved are related to curriculum development and program delivery for ESL.

2.3.1. The ESL Funding Policy: Implications for Programmming

It is evident that the ESL funding policy directly affects ESL programming by determining the target audience for whom provincial curricula are developed and by influencing the nature of local level program delivery, even to the extent of affecting the ability of school boards to develop and run ESL programs. Although funding is not the focus of this study, the significance of the present funding policy for ESL in Alberta as it relates to programming issues is recognized and discussed below.

I. Defining the ESL Student

In order for ESL curriculum development and program delivery to be successful, the distinguishing characteristics of the individuals for whom funding will be provided and whom the program will be required to serve, must be identified clearly. An overview of the ways in which ESL students have been defined and described in places other than Alberta is necessary in order to help verify the issues raised earlier with regard to the adequacy of ESL student definitions used by Alberta Education.

Definitions of ESL students developed by several ministries of Education appear below and illustrate the basis on which various educational authorities plan for ESL programming. Following that is a description of the definitions that Alberta Education currently employs for ESL funding and programming. Since this study focuses on Alberta, the majority of definitions cited are taken from other Canadian provinces. However, a sample of how two educational departments in the United States describe the ESL student is also included.

In the United States, students who speak English as a Second Language are often given the label "LEP" (Limited English Proficient) (Ohio State Department of Education, 1983) and are defined as:

> ...students whose native language is other than English, and who have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language to be unable to learn successfully in the classroom where English is the only language of instruction... (p.6).

The definition varies across states. For example, the School Code of Illinois (as cited in Hoegel, 1985) contains this definition:

> Children of limited-English-speaking ability means children who were not born in the United States whose Native tongue is a language other than English and who are incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English; and children who were born in the United States of parents possessing no or limited-English-speaking ability and who are incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English (p.7).

In Canada, the Department of Education for the Province of Manitoba (1981) uses the following criteria in some curricular documents to define the ESL student: "[The ESL student] is one whose command of English does not allow [her or him] to participate successfully in school and community situations. [This] may be a student who has learned English as a second language or (has) had a limited exposure to English" (p.1).

Students in Manitoba who fit this definition are given the same label as that used in the previous sample definitions from the United States. They are called LEP students. Other curricular documents prepared by the same Department of Education contain a slightly expanded definition which makes reference to Natives and children born in Canada to New Canadians, and also mentions those students who use a second 'dialect' of English.
This definition describes ESL students as:

> ...many capable students who are unable to succeed in school because their command of "English is limited: New Canadians, the children of New Canadians, or Native people. They may also be students who regularly use a dialect of English that differs significantly from standard English, or

> students whose language experiences both in and out of school, have not adequately prepared them for...education (p.1).

ESL students are defined in the following manner by the Ministry of Education in the Province of British Columbia (1981): "ESL students are those whose progress in the English speaking school system is not commensurate with their age and/or abilities due to the fact that English is not their first language" (p.3).

This Ministry also defines students who speak a dialect of English; "ESD students are those whose dialect is significantly different from that used by the school system so as to restrict their progress" (p.3).

In the Province of Ontario (George, 1987), the description of an ESL student is as follows: "ESL refers to the development of English language proficiency for students who have recently entered Ontario schools from a Non-English speaking country" (p.8).

The only evidence in the previous examples of any restrictions to the ESL student profile based on either country of origin or grade in school appears in this last definition, where recent arrival from a non-English speaking country is a requirement for being considered an ESL student.

Since the early 1980s, the Province of Alberta has employed two working definitions of an ESL student. One definition has been intended for the purpose of programming, the other for determining the need for funding. The former appears in the Alberta Education (1982) document entitled "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs" and reads; "an English as a Second Language (ESL) student is one whose first language is other than English" (p.8).

An ESL Program definition enlarges upon that of the ESL student definintion and appears in the same document:

> An English as a Second Language Program is one that is developed to meet the needs of those students who have not yet achieved functional fluency in the English language and thus may not be achieving at a level commensurate with their age and/or abilities (p.8).

English as a second dialect students and programs are also mentioned in the 1982 document as follows:

> A Second Dialect (SD) student is one whose dialect of English is different from that used in Alberta schools. A Second Dialect program is one that is developed to meet the needs of those students who may

> not be achieving at a level commensurate with their age and/or abilities because of the difference in dialects (p.8).

For purposes related to funding (Alberta Education, 1986), the ESL student in Alberta is defined as one who, "having recently arrived in the province, require(s) special assistance in learning English as a Second Language so (he/she) can follow instruction in English" (p.1, 3a).

An examination of some definitions of ESL/D students used in the United States and by other Canadian provinces makes apparent the need to consider carefully how Alberta Education's description of this student group will affect the programming available to students who require it. Unlike the other jurisdictions cited (excepting Ontario), which focus on the student's ability to function in English, Alberta Education defines the ESL student for funding purposes, and consequently, programming, in terms of place of origin.

Also, since eligibility for a Language Program Grant for ESL in Alberta is dependent upon the pupils in question being in grades 1 to 12 (Alberta Education, 1987a), Alberta ESL students who are receiving Early

Childhood Service programming are excluded from ESL funding and programming (p.2).

Ideally, the definitions used for programming and funding for ESL students in Alberta should describe the same student group. The obvious disparity that exists between them suggests that there may be ESL students who are not benefitting from ESL programming and who are therefore being denied equal opportunity in education. If this is the case, then there should be a reconsideration of the criteria used in Alberta to define the ESL student with the possibility of the removal of the existing restrictions concerning place of origin and grade level. Such measures would bring about a need for adjustments to be made to programming in order to accommodate students with ESL needs who were born in Alberta and/or those at the ECS level. The question as to what form such adjustments should take warrants further investigation based on information regarding the characteristics and needs of the two non-funded groups.

Kingwell (1987) expressed concern for the lack of ESL assistance for ECS students and gave the following reasons for making this group eligible for funding: numbers of ESL students entering school at the ECS level are growing; there is a need for parental involvement in

ECS activities and thus the need for interpretors; some students may need to be allowed to repeat ECS; and there is evidence in the literature that ESL instruction can be effective at the ECS level (p.2).

In recent years the numbers of ESL students at the ECS level in Alberta have been quite high. Figures showing numbers of grade one students enrolled in ESL programs in 1986-87 and recorded by Alberta Education indicate that in the 1985-86 school year there may have been as many as 831 ECS students who required ESL instruction in the province of Alberta, which is approximately 20 percent of the total number of ESL students enrolled (See Appended Table A-1).

Research in the area of ESL instruction at the pre-school/ECS level reveals varying opinions as to the type of programming that is most beneficial for younger children. A research project conducted by Juergen Hoegel in 1985 produced results which reinforced the importance of beginning second language instruction at kindergarten and preschool levels. The investigation included a survey of state and federally funded bilingual programs in Illinois public schools as well as consultations with nationally known early childhood educators in the United States.

The conclusions drawn from this study lend support to the suggestion that ESL instruction can benefit ECS students. Hoegel (1985) states that "younger children are especially likely to have had little exposure to English since their early language experiences in the home environment with parents, relatives, peers, and friends may be predominantly or exclusively in the home language" (p.28).

He also emphasizes that there are short and long term advantages for the child who is given second language instruction at the ECS level. Improved readiness for school, gains in language proficiency (vocabulary development, comprehension, oral language use etc.) are several short term benefits. For the long term (ie., subsequent grade levels), Hoegel describes a reduction in language-related learning difficulties for children who have participated in ECS programs where ESL instruction has been given (p.29).

In British Columbia, a demonstration ESL preschool project was initiated in 1982 (Wakefield, 1984) based upon the assumptions that ESL preschoolers would benefit from early introduction to English, that they would readily accept English as just another vehicle for communication, and that bilingualism can develop easily and naturally for children in a comfortable, non-threatening atmosphere.

One of the conclusions drawn from research concerning this two year project (Wakefield, 1984) was that "ESL children enrolled in a preschool program where English is established as the medium of communication will not require English language ability, as measured on the Preschool Language Scale (P.L.S.), in order to achieve social competence as measured on a social interaction scale (PI, Q-ES)" (p.5).

Also identified in this study was the need for an adjusted, diversified preschool program to be developed for children from various cultural and language backgrounds.

Derrick (1977) agrees that attention needs to be given to development of language programming for the ECS child who has ESL needs; "If any single age group of children were to be given priority in the special provision of language instruction, a good argument could be made for the infant or first school age range [5-7 years]" (p.31).

She supported her opinion with information provided by British infant school teachers for a Schools Council Working paper which dealt with the teaching of English to children of immigrants in Britain. The anecdotal evidence she cited showed that:

> ...after two years of education in an infant school, many minority group children still lag far behind their English-speaking peers when they enter the junior school. It is not uncommon for them to be placed in a special class and to receive some of the specialist language instruction they might have benefited from in those earlier years (p.32).

Data collected by Bain, (1981) for a local level ESL needs assessment conducted for Edmonton Public schools, prompted recommendations which strongly favour some kind of special programming for ESL children at the Early Childhood level. In the ensuing report, Bain recommended to the Edmonton Public School Board that "...ESL programmes be extended to Kindergarten" (p.47). He also reported that the parents he surveyed viewed such programmes as "bilingual programmes, that is, kindergarten conducted in English and the heritage language" (pp.47-48).

This suggestion is supported by others in favour of some form of mother tongue teaching in the early years of formal schooling. Chapman, referring to studies in mother tongue teaching in Britain in 1980 (As cited in N.U.T. 1982), indicated that:

> ...children taught basic skills in their mother tongue in a bilingual education programme (eg Punjabi in Bradford) make better progress than children in control groups who are taught only in English, and that time spent being taught in their own language does not impair their acquisition of English, and may even assist the process (p.3).

Other researchers concede that, at the ECS level, there are distinct advantages to teaching through the mother tongue alone. Collier (1987) reported that cross sectional data collected from 1977 to 1986 in a U.S. public school system imply that "...5-, 6-, and 7-year-old arrivals might acquire English for academic purposes more rapidly if they were provided a minimum of 2 years continuing cognitive academic development in the L1." (p.637). The conditions of that study were similar to those of large urban school districts in Alberta, in that most of the students who were subjects were immigrant children representing over 75 different languages.

The benefit of conducting early instruction exclusively in a child's first language is also indicated in research cited by Cummins (1986). He refers to a Spanish preschool program initiated by the Carpentaria school district in Santa Barbara, California, the aim of which was to "...bring Spanish-dominant children entering kindergarten up to a level of readiness for school similar to that attained by English-speaking children in the community." (p.31).

According to Cummins, focussing on the development of language skills in the L1 of these preschool children "proved to be highly successful in developing students' readiness skills" and helped them to perform better than other Spanish-background students when they entered Grade One and were tested for fluency in English (p.31).

Derrick (1977) is in agreement with the theory that early instruction in mother tongue is desireable, as she indicates in the following statement:

> It could be hypothesized that from the consequent emotional and social security, and the acquisition of skills through the mother tongue, the eventual learning of English might well be easier and in the long term more successful. The acceptance and fostering of the children's mother tongue within the nursery school would also strengthen the school's links with parents and community (p.51).

In her article "Practical Hints for Coping with Limited English in the Early Childhood Classroom", (Ashdown, 1982) a Kindergarten teacher from Alberta shared her views concerning the ECS child with ESL needs:

> He is very scared, you know! If he has come from a home where English, as we know it, is not the first language, and the cultural expectations have been very different, he is at a tremendous disadvantage when suddenly thrust into a busy, bright, fast-talking (to him, anyway!) classroom where English is the only language spoken. His earlier experiences may have been meagre and narrow from our cultural viewpoint meaning a lack of toys, books, games, field trips, etc...in fact, a definite lack of all those language experiences which most Kindergarten teachers feel are the pre-school requisites of their program (pp.9-10).

It is evident from the research and opinions presented above that the provision of some sort of programming for ESL students at the ECS level is widely supported, although ideas as to the the exact form that instruction should take vary.

In 1986, almost one quarter of the total immigrant population aged 0-18 entering Alberta were in the 0-5 age bracket (See Table 1). Figures such as these, which indicate that a substantial number of the ESL student population are or soon will be entering ECS programs in the province, combine with the research findings already cited to suggest that the issue needs to be investigated further, and that the type of ESL programming most appropriate for this age group should be determined.

The characteristics of ESL students who are born in the province of Alberta (resident students) must also be considered in the development of curriculum and programs if ESL programming is to meet the needs of all pupils who require ESL assistance in Alberta. Several distinct groups of resident students who may require ESL instruction have been identified by various sources (Kingwell, 1987; McLeod-Risseeuw, 1987; Piper, 1986). These include Native children who first learn an Indian language such as Stoney, Cree, or Blackfoot and who may arrive in school with little or no knowledge of the English language (Burnaby, 1986). Children who are born in Alberta and who grow up in Hutterite colonies often arrive in school having had limited or no exposure to English, since German is their first language and is spoken predominantly in the home (Piper, 1986). Another group belonging to the resident student category is made up of children born in Alberta to immigrant families. These children may also learn a language other than English and may not be introduced to English until they arrive at school when they are five or six years old (Kingwell, 1987).

The diversity of the resident student population, like that of the "recently arrived in Alberta" group, necessitates an approach to programming which will make provision for the differing language needs that are present. This point is illustrated in a statement made by Burnaby (1986) concerning the differences between immigrant and Native Canadian ESL needs; "...the context for the teaching of official languages differs radically [from that of immigrants] for most Native speaking learners" (p.12).

Piper (1986) investigated the situation in schools in the Hutterite colonies of southern Alberta where teachers deal with students for whom English is a second language. She reported that conditions for these teachers are, in her opinion, "...worse than any experienced by urban teachers" (p.6). She also indicated additional differences that exist between these teaching/learning situations and others across the province; "...much of the published material available to teachers through the school district is inappropriate for children who have little knowledge of the world beyond the colony..." (p.6). Her report tells of teachers in these colonies who have no library, no assistants, and no audio-visual aids. Magazines and newspapers are also forbidden by the majority of colonies.

At present, ECS students, and children born to Natives, Hutterites, and immigrants to Alberta, are required to receive academic instruction in English. A recent report has recommended that they be considered eligible for ESL funding (Hunt and Wyllie, 1988).

If the funding policy for ESL in Alberta were reviewed and the financial assistance mentioned above made available, then significant implications for ESL programming could be expected. A better understanding of how teachers and other school personnel deal with the situation at present would be a definite, positive, contribution to any impending programming changes.

II. Factors Related to Funding that Affect Program Delivery

A. The Per-Pupil Nature of the Current ESL Funding Policy

The following table shows the number of immigrants from the age of 0-18 years who arrived in various zones in Alberta in 1986.

Table 1

Numbers of Immigrants from 0-18 years Arriving in Alberta in 1986

Zone	Number of Immigrants Aged 0-18 Yrs.
Calgary	953
Edmonton	892
Fort McMurray	21
Lethbridge	51
Medicine Hat	38
Red Deer	51
Other	219
Total	2225

(Alberta Immigration and Settlement Services, 1986, p.2)

The higher concentration of immigrants in Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat indicates that the majority of students who have recently arrived in the province reside, at least initially, in the larger urban centres. The predominantly urban distribution of newly arrived students qualifying for ESL funding and therefore, instruction, is illustrated by figures representing recent enrolment of students by grade in ESL programs in counties and school divisions across the province. (See Appended Table A-1).

Again, the heaviest distributions appear in the larger urban school districts, indicating that the greatest numbers of funded ESL students who are being offered ESL programs attend schools in larger urban centres. It is evident that, since the structuring of ESL funding is on a per/pupil basis, the larger juristictions are in a better financial position to provide ESL programs, owing to their large enrolments of 'qualifying' ESL students. Smaller rural boards, having lower numbers of ESL students who are eligible for funding (as indicated by the figure for 'other' in Table 1) would not be as likely to operate ESL programs. It is possible that the per/pupil nature of the ESL funding policy is preventing school boards from setting up and delivering ESL programs even though such programs may be required.

B. The September 30 Cut-off Date

Another issue related to the funding of ESL students is that of the September 30 cut-off date for funding eligibility. As stated earlier, if students arrive in school after the September 30 deadline, they are ineligible for the ESL language program grant assistance. As a result, some boards may be unable to offer programs even though they may have students entering throughout the year who need ESL instruction.

As indicated previously, funded ESL students will qualify for the language program grants for three school years if they are attending school in a jurisdiction that provides programs for ESL students. It follows that if a school board does not offer an ESL program, then no funding will be available for any ESL student in attendance there. Yet, if no funding is available, it is difficult for a school board to develop and run a program. There is a need to discover the extent to which this problematic cycle is affecting the education of pupils who require ESL instruction and to determine whether or not changes to the structure of funding might alleviate the difficulty.

C. The Three Year Limit on Funding

A related concern is that of the three year limit placed on the grants for ESL students. If students who are fortunate enough to be enrolled in ESL programs require longer than three years to become sufficiently proficient in English, as is reported in recent research concerning the rate of acquisition of English for academic purposes (Collier, 1987), then the three year limit may need to be examined in order for all ESL students to benefit from ESL programming.

All of the above issues that stem from the funding of ESL students are of importance to the study of ESL curriculum development and program delivery. The questions raised by concerned groups and further supported by the literature are to be investigated in this research in order to gain information from superintendents and other stakeholder groups that might serve to broaden the knowledge base from which planners and policy makers can draw.

2.3.2 Directions in ESL Curriculum

The issues brought to the fore by concerned groups and mentioned above make direct reference to certain aspects of curriculum development at the provincial level. This study is particularly concerned with discovering how well the ESL curricula developed and distributed by Alberta Education is serving the school personnel who are trying to meet the needs of ESL students.

As mentioned earlier, curriculum development for ESL in Alberta to date has included guidelines and suggestion manuals for elementary and junior high and for the setting up of ESL programs, as well as some credit and non-credit courses for ESL at the senior high level. Various researchers have commented on the need for ESL curricula that addresses the specific needs of ESL students through the framework of the concepts and content required for general subject areas such as language arts, mathematics, etc.(Mohan 1987; Patrie 1985; Chamot; 1983 and Massey; 1985)

Often referred to as focussing on an integration of language and content (Mohan 1987) this approach to curriculum development is based on the theory that in order for successful second language acquisition to occur, the language must be used in meaningful contexts through the development of cognitive and academic skills in the various academic subject areas.

In discussing desireable guidelines for establishing an ESL curriculum, Chamot (1983) emphasizes that "thorough familiarity with the regular curriculum is an essential beginning" (p.464).

Patrie (1985) also supports the theory of language aquisition through content learning, as illustrated in his comments regarding the mainstreaming of elementary level ESL students

> Only by so doing [mainstreaming] will the ESL child be in a contextualized environment where he or she can interact in a meaningful and natural way with the language. And it is only in this environment that the language can be successfully acquired. The child will acquire the language by focusing on the content of the arithmetic, social studies, art, and language arts programs of the elementary school curriculum in the same fashion that we all acquire fluency in our mother tongue by focusing on the content of the world around us (p.17).

Massey (1985) reported that "The attempts we are seeing at developing materials for the teaching of English through content, or even through immersion, are still isolated efforts that have not yet reached the mainstream of ESL curriculum" (p.267).

These opinions and reports indicate that efforts should be made to develop curricula which can be used by all those who are responsible for the education of ESL students, in order to facilitate language acquisition through the content area subjects.

Mohan (1987) sums this up nicely in the following statement concerning the changes that he feels would improve programming for ESL students:

> While there is nothing wrong with large-scale curriculum development, changes in school programs are more likely to succeed if they build on what individual teachers find feasible and useful rather than if practices are imposed on teachers from above, especially if teachers consider them impractical or unnecessary (Sarasson, 1982). In general, change is more likely to occur when common ground is found among language teachers and content teachers; this is, when the focus is on issues of common concern to all teachers of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students (p.22-23).

It is evident that in order for the ESL curriculum to be useful for teaching language through content, it needs to be both accessible to all non-ESL teachers and staff and formulated in such a way that it can be used by them for teaching the various content area subjects to ESL students. Obviously, contributions from individuals such as mathematics, science, and other non-ESL teachers would be necessary in order to achieve the requirements of this type of curricula.

It is hoped that this study will be able to collect information from school staff which will indicate how well the present ESL curricula developed by Alberta Education is meeting the needs of ESL and non-ESL teachers and support personnel. Also, the information gathered may provide insight into the type of curricula that these individuals feel would be most appropriate for helping ESL students to acquire the English language and cognitive/academic skills they require.

2.3.3 ESL Program Delivery Models

There are many ways of defining and classifying the manner in which ESL programs are delivered, that is, the way in which ESL students are grouped for instruction. Alberta Education (1982) describes seven different models in the ESL document entitled "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs". These program types have been identified as those commonly found in schools. Also included with these descriptions are two objectives that were said to apply to ESL/D programs in Canada at that time. They are; "To teach 'standard' Canadian English, ('are mine), [and] to provide students with information and support during their adjustment to a new school system and a different cultural environment" (p.41-42).

A programming profile for ESL in Alberta would benefit from information gathered from superintendents, principals and other school staff concerning the type of ESL program delivery model that is being used most often at present by schools in this province. One of the aims of this study will be to gain such information.

2.3.4 Teacher Preparation and Professional Development

Training and ongoing professional development for teachers who are or who may be responsible for educating ESL students is extremely important and central to the provision of good ESL programming.

Ten years ago a survey of publicly supported ESL programs in Canada was conducted (Acheson and Newsham 1978). The study found that few ESL programs at that time had any clearly stated, minimum requirements for their ESL teachers. It was also reported that the most frequent suggestions made by the program planners and teachers surveyed was for more and better training in TESL methodology and for inservice and full time academic training. One of the most revealing and disturbing discoveries made in this suvey was that the respondents did not seem concerned about the need to make teachers more aware of cultural differences.

In contrast with this perspective, Baker (1982), is of the opinion that it is essential for an ESL teacher to possess cultural sensitivity and to take courses in cross-cultural communication. The importance of Non-ESL teachers being educated as to the needs of the ESL students has been expressed by Thompson (1986) and by Alberta Education (1982). Thompson asked members of the Alberta Teachers Of English as a Second Language Association to encourage non-ESL teachers to take advantage of the support and experience of members of that organization.

This point was further reinforced in a curricular document issued by Alberta Education (1982), which contained the following statement:

> It must be stressed that specialized training in linguistic and cultural awareness and second language pedagogy must not be restricted to the domain of ESL specialists. Due to increasing numbers of non-English-speaking people moving to Alberta, the population make-up of Alberta schools has changed to the extent that every teacher at some point will encounter an ESL/D child in the classroom (p.61).

More up to date information as to the training and professional development of Alberta's teachers and support staff in courses and areas related to ESL would be a positive contribution to a profile of this province's ESL programming. It will be interesting to compare the training and inservice experience of staff today with that referred to in the 1978 study of Acheson and Newsham mentioned earlier. A survey such as the one intended for this study may yield this information and provide planners with a better profile of the professionals who are teaching and working with ESL students. It may also bring to light areas where more training and inservice would be both desireable and beneficial.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Research Questions

Following an examination of recommendations made by various educational bodies and concerned ESL teachers, and also of related research findings, the following areas of focus in ESL programming were isolated for the purpose of investigation in this study:

I. Provincial Level ESL Curriculum Development
II. Local Level ESL Program Delivery
III. The Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming
IV. Teacher Training and Professional Development for ESL.

The questions developed to serve as guidelines for this research appear below and have been grouped according to the four areas of concern listed above.

I. Provincial Level ESL Curriculum Development

A. How accessible are existing provincial ESL resources, curricular support documents, and course manuals for administrators, teaching staff, and support staff?

B. What type of curricular support documents do school personnel who may work with ESL students feel is most needed for the various grade level groups?

C. How do those staff who use present ESL curricular support documents and course manuals rate them?

D. According to school personnel, do existing curricular support documents, course manuals and resources provide adequate help for dealing with the needs of ECS, and resident ESL students?

E. Do existing curricula for other subject areas appear to provide for the educational needs of ESL students?

II. Local Level ESL Program Delivery

A. What method or type of ESL program delivery model is most common in Alberta schools?

B. Who assumes the majority of responsibility for educating ESL students in Alberta schools?

III. The Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming

A. How does the present funding policy, in particular, the per-pupil nature of the funding and the requirement that the pupil count date for grant application submission is September 30, affect the ability of local school boards to develop and run ESL programs?

B. How does the three year limit on funding affect the ability of schools to provide programs which prepare ESL students to function at a level commensurate with their age and/or abilities?

IV. Teacher Training and Professional Development for ESL

A. To what degree are Alberta's teachers trained in areas such as Multicultural, ESL, Second language, and English/Language arts education?

B. Are the majority of Alberta's teachers participating in inservice for ESL?

3.2 Research Method

3.2.1 General Study Procedure

In an effort to answer the above questions, the survey method was used to collect descriptive data from school personnel through the use of mailed questionnaires and personal interviews. The mail-out survey was planned and implemented from February to June, 1988. The personal interviews were conducted in June, 1988.

3.2.2 The Mail-Out Survey

I. Design

Survey instruments were designed, refined, and revised using suggestions found in survey research publications (Borg and Gall, 1983; Cates, 1985; Dillihunt,1984;).

II. Instrument Evaluation and Pilot Study

A. Preliminary Evaluation of the Instruments

Preliminary drafts of the survey instruments were previewed by members of the ESL Task Force at Alberta Education. This group provided feedback as to the content and organization of the questionnaires. This feedback was then used to improve the effectiveness of the instruments (Babbie,1973; Galfo,1983).

As Dillman (1978) suggests, questionnaires should be submitted to the scrutiny of three types of people; (a) colleagues of the researchers, (b) potential users of the data, and (c) people from the population to be surveyed (pp.156-57). The ESL Task Force mentioned above contained members representing two of these groups; colleagues and potential users. A pilot study was administered to the third group who were individuals from the population to be surveyed.

B. Pilot Study

The pilot study, which followed the initial revisions, was conducted in order to field test the research instrument on individuals similar to the intended respondents as advised by Galfo (1983). With the help of an Edmonton-based ESL consultant, pilot study participants were chosen in sample groups of consisting of 10 individuals, representing each of the following populations; (a) Non-ESL Teachers, (b) ESL Teachers, and (c) Special Education Teachers. A letter requesting their participation was given to the consultant and passed on to them. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix E, along with a note of thanks that was sent to those who responded.

The primary aim of the pilot study was to determine whether the questionnaires could be completed easily. Any problems or confusion arising from defects or inadequacies of the questionnaire format would be revealed by the participants. A comment sheet provided these respondents with the opportunity to evaluate the questionnaire format using a Likert scale. Space was also provided on this sheet for further comments and suggestions, as Borg and Gall suggest (1983). An examination of the completed questionnaire items using the comment sheet would reveal further information regarding the suitability of the research instruments.

The pilot study respondents were also asked to record the time that it took them to complete the questionnaire. This information was later to be conveyed to the respondents who participated in the final survey so that they would have some idea as to the time they could expect to spend doing the questionnaire. The time check would also provide an indication as to whether or not the questionnaire was too lengthy.

The instrument tested in the pilot study was the questionnaire that was designed to be administered to the three teacher groups for the final survey. It was therefore labelled the Common Teacher Questionnaire. This questionnaire was the most complex, contained the largest number of items, and was most representative of the other questionnaires that were developed for this research. Also, since the three teacher groups combined constituted the largest segment of the population to be surveyed, the possibility of the same subjects being sampled for both the pilot study and final survey would be minimized if only teachers were sampled for the pilot study. For this reason, it was felt that the testing of the Common Teacher Questionnaire would provide sufficient feedback for the revision and further development of the other questionnaires.

The response rates for the pilot study appear in appended Table F-1. Each group of teachers had a response rate of 80%. These rates were considered to be adequate for the pilot study.

Appended Table F-2 displays the results of the questionnaire format evaluation. Pilot study respondents evaluated the format favourably with the majority of their responses being in the "very good" category.

III. The Study

A. Survey Samples and Sampling Technique

Random samples of the following stakeholder groups were obtained from Alberta Education's Computer Information Services with assistance from the Associate Director of Teacher Certification and Development. In total, 1163 individuals were chosen, although some of that number (161) were were located by other methods. This alternative means of sampling is explained below, along with the breakdown of the sample groups and details of the numbers taken from each group.

1. Non-ESL Teachers

This group comprised 300 teachers who indicated that they were full time, regular classroom teachers. These teachers are not members of any of the other sample groups although there was a possibility of some overlap with the ESL teacher group, since the latter was chosen by an alternative method as indicated below.

2. Special Education Teachers

This group comprised 200 teachers who indicated that they were full time or spent more than 50 percent of their time in a special education position.

3. Principals

This group comprised 200 individuals who indicated that they were either full time or spent more than 50 percent of their time in a principalship.

4. Counsellors

This group comprised 200 individuals who indicated that they were either full time or spent more than 50 percent of their time in the position of counsellor.

5. School Psychologists

This group comprised all individuals (18) who indicated that they were either full time or spent more than 50 percent of their time in the position of school psychologist.

6. Superintendents

This group was comprised of all individuals (88) who indicated that they were either full time or spent more than 50 percent of their time in the position of superintendent.

Three other groups were surveyed but since individual names and addresses were not available through Teacher Certification for people in these positions, different procedures were required in order to obtain samples. The groups and sampling procedures appear below.

7. ESL Teachers

This group comprised 133 teachers who were designated by their school board as English as a second language teachers. With the aid of ESL supervisors and consultants, 100 ESL teachers were chosen from public and separate school boards in the two large urban centres, (Edmonton and Calgary).

Other smaller school boards were contacted by telephone and 33 ESL teachers were chosen by personnel from the superintendents' offices of those boards. The contacts who chose the ESL teachers then acted as intermediaries for the survey: they received all letters and questionnaires and then passed them on to the chosen teachers.

8. ESL Consultants

For this sample, 12 school boards were each sent a questionnaire via the office of the superintendent, labelled "ESL Consultant" for distribution to the individual assuming the ESL Consultant responsibilities.

9. English/Language Arts Consultants

For this sample, 12 school boards were each sent a questionnaire labelled "E/LA Consultant", via the office of the superintendent. A letter accompanied each questionnaire which requested that each questionnaire be distributed to the individual assuming the English/Language Arts Consultant's responsibilities.

B.Survey Instruments

Separate survey instruments, that is, mail-out questionnaires, were designed for each of the sample groups described above. The information sought from each sample group is therefore specific to that group and was not intended to be used for the purpose of cross comparison. Instead, it was to be considered as indicating the opinions and perceptions of each individual sample group.

The type of information sought from each sample group appears below. Copies of each of the instruments may be found in Appendix G.

1. Common Teacher Questionnaire

This instrument was prepared for teachers and was sent to the three teacher sample groups; a) Non-ESL, b) Special Education, and c) ESL. Each of these was accompanied by an appendix designed to collect specific information from each of the three groups. The general purpose of the Common Teacher Questionnaire was to collect teacher reports and perceptions concerning the following:

- Demographic Information
- Type of ESL Program Model
- Teacher Training and ESL Inservice Attendance
- Availability and Usefulness of Alberta Education ESL Curricula
- Type of Curricular Support Most Needed
- Availability and Use of ESL and EL/A Consultant Services for help with ESL Students
- Number of ESL Students Taught
- Characteristics of the ESL Students Taught
- resident or recent immigrant
- gaps in previous education

2. Non-ESL Appended Questionnaire

This questionnaire was appended to the Common Teacher Questonnaire and sent to members of the Non-ESL Teacher sample group. The general purpose of this instrument was to gain information concerning the following:

- How do Non-ESL teachers deal with ESL students in regular classrooms (eg. do they send the students to resource rooms, etc., or do they assume the total responsibility for these students)?
- Are those ESL students requiring special help from education and psychological services receiving it?

3. ESL Teacher Appended Questionnaire

This questionnaire was prepared for the ESL Teacher sample group and appended to the Common Teacher Questionnaire. The purpose of this instrument was to gain information concerning the following:

- How many hours per week do their ESL students at various levels of language competence receive direct ESL instruction from them?
- How many of their students who require special education and psychological services are in fact receiving them?
- How much time do their ESL students spend learning English through content area subject matter while under instruction from the ESL teacher?
- How many of their ESL students have been receiving

ESL instruction for more than three years?
- How many of their ESL students are achieving at grade level after three years of ESL instruction?
- How many of their ESL students can participate comfortably in social situations after three years in an ESL program?

4. Special Education Teacher Appended Questionnaire

This questionnaire was appended to the Common Teacher Questionnaire and was sent to members of the Special Education Teacher sample. The purpose of this instrument was to elicit the following information from special education teachers:

- With what frequency do other school staff request the help of special education teachers for matters relating to the instruction of ESL students?
- Which needs of ESL students do special education teachers feel they can meet (eg. special education needs, gaps in previous education, ESL or language related needs)?

5. Principal Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed for the purpose of eliciting the following information from school principals:

- Demographic information - location of school
- Which Alberta Education Curricular documents for ESL are available to the staff of that school?
- Does the school have an ESL program and if so; a) when was it started, b) is ESL funding received for all students receiving instruction, and c) what delivery method is used?
- How do they define an ESL student?
- If no program exists, who assumes responsibility?

6. Counsellor Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed for the purpose of gaining the following information from school counsellors:

- How many ESL Students are they working with at present?
- How many of those ESL students are ~~sent to~~ them for help in each of the following areas; social (adjustment) difficulties, academic concerns, program counselling, career counselling, and other areas?
- Are the counsellors able to assist ESL students in the areas mentioned and if not, what are the reasons?

7. School Psychologist Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed for the purpose of gaining the following information from school psychologists:

- How many ESL students are they working with?
- How many of those ESL students are sent to them for help in each of the following areas; social (adjustment) difficulties, academic concerns, and other areas?
- Are the psychologists able to assist ESL students in the areas mentioned and if not, what are the reasons?
- Are the psychologists ever required to provide ESL assessment and if not, who is responsible for that assessment?

8. English/Language Arts Consultant Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed for the purpose of eliciting the following information from E/LA consultants:

- With what frequency do various school personnel request their help with ESL and are these consultants able to help?
- What type of Alberta Education Curricular support document do they feel is most needed for ESL?

- Who offers the majority of language support to ESL students in the schools these consultants serve?
- How many schools does each consultant serve?

9. ESL Consultant Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed for the purpose of eliciting the following information from ESL consultants:

- With what frequency do various school personnel request their help with ESL students?
- What type of Alberta Education curricular support document do they feel is most needed for ESL?
- Who is responsible for the assessment and placement of ESL students in the schools these consultants serve?
- How many schools does each of these consultants serve?
- For how many ESL students is each consultant responsible?

10. Superintendent Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed for the purpose of gaining the following information from school superintendents:

- Demographic information (rural or urban board)

- How many of their schools have funded ESL programs?
- How many of their schools have ESL programs but do not get funding from Alberta Education for ESL?
- How many ESL consultant do they employ?
- How many ESL teachers do they employ?
- How many non-funded students receive ESL instruction?
- How many funded students receive ESL instruction?

Each of the questionnaires described above had a blank page attached on which the respondents were invited to provide additional information and comments regarding ESL. This gave the respondents opportunity to comment freely on the subject of ESL programming and was intended to elicit information which may not have been gained from the "set" questions.

3.2.3 Personal Interviews

In order to gain additional information regarding programming for ESL students, personal interviews were conducted with individuals who have knowledge and expertise in the area of ESL. This additional data was intended to provide more specific information in a different, more informal format in order to augment the mail-out survey data.

I. Sample Groups for Personal Interviews

Personal interviews were conducted with the following individuals who were chosen with the help of ESL consultants and Native Education personnel from Alberta Education:

A. Principal of a rural school which has a large Native population

B. Teacher from an urban school which has a large Native population

C. Teacher from a rural school which has a large Native population

D. Native language consultant for a rural school board

E. ESL teacher/Native Language consultant from a large urban board

F. ESL teacher from a large urban board

G. Teacher/Principals (2) from Hutterite colony schools

H. University professor who has studied and visited Hutterite colony schools and also has experience in the field of ESL teaching and teacher training

I. A representative for ESL from Alberta Education Regional Office in Calgary.

II. Procedure and Instruments Used for Personal Interviews

Questions relating to various general areas of ESL programming were raised with the interviewees. The individuals were then asked to comment freely and discuss their views and experiences relating to the topics. The following areas were mentioned by the researcher in order to provide some guidance and focus while at the same time endeavouring to exert minimal influence on the interviewees:

A. interviewees' interests in and experience with ESL

B. how the interviewee would define an ESL student

C. what the interviewee's views are with regard to the quality and usefulness of ESL Curricula from Alberta Education

D. what the interviewee's views are with regard to ESL program delivery methods

E. how the interviewee sees present ESL grant allocation policy affecting programming for ESL students with whom he/she works

F. what the interviewee's opinion is regarding teacher training and inservice as it applies to the ESL students with whom he/she works.

As this was meant to be as informal as possible, interviewees were not pressed to provide "answers" or to make definitive statements concerning the issues raised above. Instead, they were encouraged to talk openly and freely and to express their own views and concerns regarding ESL programming.

CHAPTER 4

DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND DISPLAY OF RESULTS

4.1 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

4.1.1 Data Collection Procedure

Data collection for the mail-out survey began on May 3, 1988, with a letter being sent to all respondents (except those who were to be contacted through intermediaries as described in Chapter 3), informing them that they had been selected to participate in the study. The letter briefly described the survey, its significance, and the importance of the respondents' contributions. It also informed the respondents that they would be receiving the questionnaires in the mail within two weeks. (See Appendix H).

The questionnaires were mailed to respondents on May 13, 1988. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a letter which reminded the respondent of the previous letter, promised confidentiality, and encouraged the respondent to complete the questionnaire and return it by Wednesday, May 25, 1988 in the stamped, addressed envelope that was provided. (See Appendix I). A telephone number was also given in case any of the respondents had questions about the survey.

The mail-out survey was concluded in the middle of June after extensive follow-up procedures had been used to ensure a good response rate. The personal interviews were conducted in late June, 1988 over a two week period and transcriptions were made of each of them.

4.1.2 Data Analysis Procedure

Data from the mail-out survey were entered and tabulated using the computer program EXCEL, which is a standard spreadsheet. The questionnaire items had been numerically coded at the time of design. Remarks and comments that respondents provided on the last page of the questionnaire were analyzed and grouped according to the main focus of each comment and the sample group and these were used to augment the data derived from the coded items.

Data from the personal interviews were transcribed and the information gained was also used in conjunction with the survey data to address the research questions.

4.2 Response Rate for Mail-Out Survey

The follow-up procedures for the mail-out survey consisted of the following:

1. A follow up letter sent to non-respondents on June 6, 1988, encouraging them to complete and return their questionnaires as soon as possible. (See Appendix J).

2. A second follow-up letter sent on June 10, 1988 to all those who had not yet responded, requesting that they do so. It was accompanied by another copy of the questionnaire which was to replace any lost or misplaced insruments (See Appendix K).

No further follow-up was required after these steps had been taken, as the response rates had risen to a favourable level. The rates of response are displayed in the following table.

Table 2

Rate of Questionnaire Return

Sample Group	No. Distributed	No. Returned	%
ESL Teachers	133	89	67
Non-ESL Teachers	300	244	81
Special Education Teachers	200	170	85
Principals	200	181	91
Superintendents	88	82	93
ESL Consultants	12	10	83
E/LA Consultants	12	10	83
School Counsellors	200	177	89
School Psychologists	18	14	78
[a] Other		27	02
No Response			14
Total	1163	1004	86

Note: [a] Those on leave, teaching adults or who had moved.

Opinions as to the minimum acceptable response rate for mail-out surveys vary according to the authority. Some researchers would accept response rates as low as 60% (Cates, 1985, p.97) while others recommend 80% as the minimum acceptable rate (Erdos, as cited in Cote et. al. 1984, pp.6-7). In an effort to reduce the bias associated with low response rates, attempts were made to reduce the non response rates for this survey as much as possible by employing the procedures described above.

The total response rate for all sample groups combined was 86%. This was considered acceptable for the purpose of this study. The individual response rates for the sample groups all exceeded 80% except for the ones for ESL teachers (67%) and school psychologists (78%). Although the latter response rate was acceptable, it would have been more desireable for the former to have been higher.

It is probable that the reason for the low ESL teacher response rate is that an intermediary had to be used for all correspondence and for the choosing of the subjects. This arrangement prevented the respondents in the ESL teacher group from receiving the first, or pre-questionnaire letter. The intermediaries were entrusted with the task of informing the ESL teachers and of passing on the subsequent information and instruments.

Any number of factors resulting from the use of intermediaries could have contributed the lower response rates. The 67% was not considered to be an unreasonable rate to expect under the circumstances. Since ESL teachers were also interviewed personally for this study and were able to provide additional information from the perspective of that sample group, the lower rate was not regarded as sufficient cause for concern.

4.3 Profile of Respondents for Mail-Out Survey

Since the respondents chosen for this study were selected randomly from the total number of individuals in each of the population groups sampled, (except for ESL teachers, and ESL and E/LA consulants) excessive overlap should have been avoided. That is, cases of several individuals being surveyed from the same school will have been kept to a minimum so that a fairer representation of the situation in different schools accross the province will have been obtained.

4.3.1 Urban and Rural Distribution of Mail-out Survey Samples

Information was gathered from both urban and rural school jurisdictions. For urban and rural definitions see Chapter 1 - Definition of Terms. Table 3 shows the percentages of each sample that were urban and rural.

Table 3

Urban and Rural Distribution of the Mail-out Survey Samples

Sample Group	n	Urban (%)	Rural (%)
ESL Teachers	89	100	00
Non-ESL Teachers	244	70	30
Special Education Teachers	170	70	30
Principals	181	62	37
Superintendents	82	24	76
ESL Consultants	10	100	00
E/LA Consultants	10	100	00
School Counsellors	177	80	20
School Psychologists	14	83	17

Because of the higher concentration of schools and staff in urban centres, the percentage of individuals sampled from urban areas is consistently higher for all groups except the Superintendent group. Of these respondents, 24% were in charge of urban jurisdictions and 76% were responsible for rural districts. The existence of a greater number of rural school districts as opposed to urban ones may explain this type of distribution.

4.3.2 Grade Levels Taught by Mail-out Survey Teachers

Samples from the two of the three teacher populations surveyed (Non-ESL, and Special Education) were drawn from the total number of teachers in the province who were teaching from Kindergarten to grade twelve at the time of the survey. As described in Chapter 3, the ESL teachers were chosen by an alternative method which could not guarantee random selection. A small number of the teacher respondents reported on the survey forms that they were teaching at the adult level. Their questionnnaires were set aside with those who had been marked as having "moved away" or taken "maternity leave". The total number of teacher respondents was then adjusted accordingly. Table 4 shows the distribution of teachers according to the grade levels at which they were teaching at the time of the survey.

Table 4

Grade Levels Taught by Teacher Sample Groups

	Teacher Sample Groups		
Grade Level	ESL (n=89)	Non-ESL (n=244)	Special Education (n=170)
		(%)	
ECS	00	01	02
1-6	36	48	48
7-9	20	17	22
10-12	31	19	05
No Response	00	00	08
Combinations of the above	12	15	15

4.4 Provincial Level ESL Curriculum Development

4.4.1 Respondents'Opinions as to the Availability, Use, and Adequacy of Provincial Curricular Support Documents, Courses, and Resources

I. The Principal Sample Group

Principals were requested to provide information as to the availability of provincial ESL curriculum and support documents and course manuals in their schools. Table 5 displays their answers.

Table 5

Availability of ESL Documents and Manuals According to Principals

	Availability			
Curricula (n=181)	Yes	No	Not Sure	No Response
			(%)	
ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions	40	30	16	12
ESL Elementary Guidelines	33	37	14	14
ESL Junior High Guidelines	12	45	11	30
ESL 10A Course Manual	04	56	07	31
ESL 10B Course Manual	04	56	07	31
ESL 10C Course Manual	04	56	07	31
None are Available	11	13	03	71

The general curricular support document "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs" was reported "available" by 40% of the principals surveyed. It was reported as "not available" by 30% of the respondents.

Although the document "ESL Elementary Guidelines and

Suggestions" has only recently been released, 33% of the principals surveyed indicated that it was already available in their schools. The document "ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions" appears to be less well distributed, likely owing to the fact that it is the most recent release (1988).

The very low percentages of principals reporting "yes" for the availability of the ESL 10A, B, and C course manuals is not surprising, since these are high school level courses which are likely to be offered only in senior high schools where ESL programs exist, and not in the majority of schools.

Of those principals surveyed, 11% chose "yes" for the "none are available" category indicating that none of the ESL curriculum support documents and course manuals were available in their schools.

II. The Teacher Sample Groups

A. Evaluation of the Document "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs"

The 1982 ESL Guidelines and Suggestions document was rated by the three teacher groups on a five point scale from "poor" to "excellent". Alternatives were also provided for the respondents who had "never heard of it", had "heard of it but don't know how to obtain it", had "access to it but no time to read it", and had "read it but found it to be of no use".

The data for this particular question could appear in one table only, but in order to make the information more clear, it has been separated into two tables, 6 and 7. Table 6 displays the ratings provided by the three teacher groups who indicated that they had used the document.

Table 6

Teacher Evaluation of the Document "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs"

	Teacher Sample Groups		
Rating	ESL (n=61)	Non-ESL (n=4)	Special Education (n=6)
		(%)	
Poor	07	00	00
Fair	20	75	67
Good	58	25	33
Very Good	13	00	00
Excellent	02	00	00

Of the ESL teacher group, 69% had used this document. Of that number, 58% rated it as "good". Of the Non-ESL and Special Education teachers 80% and 76% respectively had never used the document. Table 7 shows the reasons that they and the remainder of the ESL teacher group gave for not using the document.

Table 7

Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Using the Document "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs"

	Teacher Sample Groups		
Reason	ESL (n=26)	Non-ESL (n=195)	Special Education (n=130)
		(%)	
Never Heard of it	50	72	89
Heard if but don't know how to obtain it	15	05	05
Have access to it but no time to read it	15	04	05
Have read it but found it to be of no use	19	01	02

The most prevalent reason given by all three teacher groups for not using the document was that they had "never heard of it". It should be noted at this point that only 40% of all the principals surveyed reported that this document was available in their school (Table 5), and this is a factor which may be related to teachers having never heard of it.

B. Evaluation of the Document "ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions"

The ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions document has only been available to schools since the autumn of 1987. As for tables 6 and 7, the information from this question has been displayed in two tables, 8 and 9. The results of the evaluation of this document by the teacher-users appear in Table 8.

Table 8

Teacher Evaluation of The Document "ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions"

	Teacher Sample Groups		
Rating	ESL (n=37)	Non-ESL (n=6)	Special Education (n=6)
		(%)	
Poor	00	00	00
Fair	18	17	17
Good	55	67	67
Very Good	21	17	17
Excellent	05	00	00

Of the ESL teachers who have used this document, most gave it a rating of "fair" to "very good". Only very small numbers of the other two teacher groups had used the document but also provided similar ratings. Table 9 displays the reasons provided by those respondents who had not used the document.

Table 9

Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Using the Document "ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions"

Reason	Teacher Sample Groups ESL (n=49)	Non-ESL (n=198)	Special Education (n=141)
		(%)	
Never heard of it	12	66	60
Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it	04	03	03
Have access to it but no time to read it	06	02	04
Have read it but found it to be of no use	08	03	01
Not applicable for my level	69	29	33

Of the Non-ESL and Special Education teacher respondents, 66% and 60% respectively, had never heard of the document and so, had never used it. The main reason given by the ESL teachers who had not used the document was that it was not applicable for the grade level at which they were teaching when the survey took place, that is, they were not teaching at the elementary level. A substantial number of the Non-ESL and Special Education teachers also indicated the same.

C. Evaluation of the Document "ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions"

The ESL Junior High Guidelines document was available to schools as of May, 1988. In spite of the recency of its introduction, some of the ESL teachers had used the document and were able to provide an evaluation of it, as Table 10 illustrates. As above, the following data have been separated into two tables, 10 and 11.

Table 10

Teacher Evaluation of the Document "ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions"

	Teacher Sample Groups		
Rating	ESL (n=18)	Non-ESL (n=3)	Special Education (n=3)
		(%)	
Poor	11	00	00
Fair	28	67	33
Good	56	33	00
Very Good	04	00	66
Excellent	00	00	00

Reasons provided by respondents for not using the document are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11

Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Using the Document "Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions"

Reason	ESL (n=67)	Non-ESL (n=211)	Special Education (n=145)
		(%)	
Never Heard of it	07	51	46
Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it	03	01	01
Have access to it but no time to read it	06	02	01
Have read it but found it to be of no use	01	00	01
Not applicable for my level	82	46	50

Only 7% of the ESL teachers reported that they had not used this document because they had never heard of it.

The percentages of the other two teacher groups choosing the "never heard of it" alternative are lower on the average for this document than for the documents discussed previously. This indicates that in spite of the recency of its introduction, the document "ESL Guidlines and Suggestons for Junior High" is fairly well known. A number of respondents from all three teacher groups indicated that the document was not applicable for their level. This would represent those who were teaching at the elementary level at the time of the survey.

D. Teacher Evaluation of ESL Course Manuals

The course manuals for ESL 10A, ESL 10B, and ESL 10C, became available in 1986 and 1987. ESL teachers are the primary users of all three documents as Table 12 illustrates. However, a few Non-ESL and Special Education teachers indicated familiarity with the documents and provided ratings as well.

Tables 12 and 13 contain data from one question as in several cases mentioned above. The information has been separated to make it more clear.

Table 12

ESL Teacher Evaluation of ESL 10A, 10B, and 10C, Course Manuals

Rating	ESL Teachers		
n =	28	24	22
		(%)	
	10A	10B	10C
Poor	00	00	05
Fair	14	13	00
Good	57	54	59
Very Good	25	25	27
Excellent	04	08	09

The most common rating given by ESL teachers for all three manuals was "good". There was insufficient response from the other two sample groups to warrent displaying their answers in percentages. The one Non-ESL teacher who responded rated the documents as "good", and the one Special Education teacher who responded rated the documents as "fair".

Table 13 shows that the ESL teachers who had not used the documents chose "not applicable for my level" as the most common reason, indicating that they were teaching at either the elementary or junior high levels. The most prevalent reasons for Non-ESL and Special Education teachers not using the manuals were either that they had never heard of them or that the manuals were not applicable for the grade levels at which they were teaching.

Table 13

Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Using the ESL 10A, 10B, and 10C Course Manuals

	Teacher Sample Groups								
Reason	ESL			Non-ESL			Special Ed.[a]		
n =	59	62	64	211	210	209	147	149	148
					(%)				
	10A	10B	10C	10A	10B	10C	10A	10B	10C
Never Heard of it	19	21	20	64	65	66	57	56	57
Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it	02	00	00	01	01	01	01	01	01
Have access to it but no time to read it	03	02	02	01	01	01	01	00	00
Have read it but found it to be of no use	03	02	03	00	00	00	01	01	01
Not applicable for my level	73	76	75	34	33	33	41	42	41

Note: Special Education Teachers[a]

F. Use and Rating of Available ESL Resource Sources by Teachers

ESL teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they had used resources from a selection of available sources. They were also asked to rate each alternative source as to how useful they found it to be. Tables 14 and 15 display the results provided by the ESL teacher group surveyed.

Table 14

Use of Available ESL Resource Sources by ESL Teachers

Source (n=89)	Used	Never Used	No Response
		(%)	
School Board ESL Resource Centre	91	07	02
Consultant recommended resources	84	10	06
General subject area curriculum guides	76	17	07
E/LA curriculum guides	82	13	04
ESL documents from Alberta Education	88	09	03
Other Sources[a]	07	01	92

Note: Other sources[a] referred to such things as self developed resources and those shared with colleagues.

Table 15

Rating of Available ESL Resource Sources by ESL Teachers

		% Indicating				
Source	n	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
School Board ESL Resource Centre	81	10	14	15	36	26
Consultant recommended resources	75	07	16	35	27	16
General subject area curriculum guides	68	22	35	31	12	00
E/LA curriculum guides	73	19	25	45	11	00
ESL documents from Alberta Education	78	10	33	45	06	05
[a] Other Sources	6	33	00	17	17	33

Note: Other sources[a] referred to such things as self developed resources and those shared with colleagues.

Of the ESL teachers who answered, a large number gave ratings of "very good" to "excellent" to the School Board ESL Resource Centre alternative and also to the Recommended Resources from Consultant alternative. The majority of responses concerning the other listed alternatives tended to fall between "fair" and "good".

The same question was asked of the Non-ESL and Special Education teacher groups. The main feature revealed by their responses was that many of them had never used the majority of the alternative sources for ESL resources. The Alberta Education Documents and School Board Resource Centre alternatives were both reported as "never used" by over 50% of these two teacher groups, as Tables 16 and 17, and Tables 18 and 19 illustrate.

Table 16

Use of Available ESL Resource Sources By Non-ESL Teachers

Source (n=244)	Used	Never Used	No Response
		(%)	
School Board ESL Resource Centre	17	58	25
Consultant recommended resources	21	55	25
General subject area curriculum guides	29	45	26
E/LA curriculum guides	27	47	26
ESL documents from Alberta Education	16	58	27
Other Sources[a]	02	11	87

Note: Other sources[a] referred to such things as self developed resources and those shared with colleagues.

Table 17

Rating of Available ESL Resource Sources by Non-ESL Teachers Who Used Them

		% Indicating				
Source	n	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
School Board ESL Resource Centre	42	36	17	24	19	05
Consultant recommended resources	51	22	18	37	20	04
General subject area curriculum guides	71	51	20	27	01	01
E/LA curriculum guides	66	36	26	27	08	03
ESL documents from Alberta Education	38	24	39	24	08	05
Other [a] Sources	5	20	00	20	20	40

Note: Other sources[a] referred to such things as self developed resources and those shared with colleagues.

Table 18

Use of Available ESL Resource Sources By Special Education Teachers

Source (n=170)	Used	Never Used	No Response
		(%)	
School Board ESL Resource Centre	22	53	25
Consultant recommended resources	33	45	22
General subject area curriculum guides	35	41	24
E/LA curriculum guides	36	41	24
ESL documents from Alberta Education	16	59	24
Other Sources[a]	05	06	89

Note: Other sources[a] referred to such things as self developed resources and those shared with colleagues.

Table 19

Rating of Available ESL Resource Sources by Special Education Teachers Who Used Them

		% Indicating				
Source	n	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
School Board ESL Resource Centre	38	30	16	34	13	08
Consultant recommended resources	56	13	23	34	23	07
General subject area curriculum guides	60	43	30	17	08	02
E/LA curriculum guides	61	30	31	33	03	03
ESL documents from Alberta Education	28	14	21	54	07	04
[a] Other Sources	8	00	33	00	25	38

Note: Other sources[a] referred to such things as self developed resources and those shared with colleagues.

III. Respondent Comments Regarding Availability and Adequacy of ESL Support Documents, Course Manuals, and Resources

Various comments made by respondents regarding curriculum and resources for ESL have been extracted from the survey comment sheets and are quoted immediately below.

A. ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "I was assigned the ESL class one week into the school term. There was [sic] no resources except an all-day curriculum guide."

B. Special Education Teacher Sample Group

- " If there are Native ESL pamphlets or even general ESL procedure guidelines that you send out, I would appreciate receiving a copy. I will be looking for the Elementary document you've mentioned in this survey."

- "I found it difficult to find material to use although [we have an] itinerant teacher, I was never made aware of any of the resources you speak of in this survey."

- "Is there some way of acquainting rural teachers with the ESL resources available?"

- "Programs and guides should be available at least at district levels but preferably in all schools."

C. Counsellor Sample Group

- "Information regarding relevant research to assist resource/support personnel working with ESL students should be forwarded from Alberta Education as regularly as is possible."

- "Regular teachers need to be provided with information and ideas on how to support ESL students."

- "[There is a] need for information regarding the specifics of their [ESL students] cultures for counsellors."

- "[My] school needs to be provided with extensive information about the ESL student."

- "Regular classroom teachers are frustrated because of a lack of special resources/time to deal with ESL."

D. Non-ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "It would help if the documents mentioned [in the survey] were available in all schools."

- A list of books or films or any source of information [for ESL] available would help."

- "To reach the regular classroom teachers, materials or a list of materials available or procedure to follow should be sent directly to them."

Theses comments support the results of the questionnaire responses in that they stress the need for ESL information and resources to be made more accessible to teachers and other Non-ESL school staff.

4.4.2 ESL Curriculum Support Documents and Course Manuals Recommended by ESL Consultants

ESL consultants were asked to indicate which documents they recommended to the teachers they serve. Table 20 shows the percentages of consultants who recommend the various documents and manuals.

Table 20

ESL Documents Recommended by ESL Consultants

Document (n=10)	Consultants Recommending Each (%)
ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions	80
ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions	60
ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions	40
ESL 10A Course Manual	20
ESL 10B Course Manual	20
ESL 10C Course Manual	20
None	20

The most widely recommended document is the ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions, followed by the document entitled, ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs. Since all of the ESL consultants surveyed indicated that their responsiblities included serving elementary schools, (see Appended Table L-1) it is not surprising that the elementary guidelines are most often recommended by them. This would also account for the slightly lower percentage recommending the documents for junior and senior high.

These data indicate that local level ESL consultants do appear to be doing their part in recommending the various documents that have been prepared by Alberta Education for English as a second language.

4.4.3 Type of Curricular Support Document Considered by Teachers and Consultants to be Most Needed

The three teacher groups, the ESL consultants, and the E/LA consultants were all asked to indicate the type of curricular support document that they feel is most needed for ESL. They were given a choice of three types and an "other" category. Table 21 displays the choices most favoured by each respondent group.

Table 21

Type of ESL Curricular Support Document Seen by Teachers and Consultants to be Most Needed

	Sample Groups				
	Teachers			Consultants	
Document	ESL	Non-ESL	Special Education	ESL	E/LA
n =	89	207	155	10	10
			(%)		
ESL program of studies	40	32	26	60	00
ESL teaching suggestions in all subject area curriculum guides	38	43	52	20	70
General guidelines and suggestions	17	24	22	20	20
Other	04	01	00	00	10

The majority of the ESL teachers favoured an ESL program of studies and the incorporation of ESL teaching suggestions into all subject area curriculum guides. This reinforces the suggestion made by Kingwell (1987) regarding the inclusion of guidelines for ESL teaching in content area curriculum guides. High percentages of the other two teacher groups also chose these two types of curricular support as being the most appropriate. The ESL consultant group showed a strong preference for the ESL program of studies and the E/LA consultants group strongly supported the inclusion of ESL teaching suggestions in content area curriculum guides. Additional comments made by respondents regarding the issue of the most appropriate form of ESL curriculum appear below. These also underline the need for both an ESL program of studies, which was suggested by the Secondary Education Instructional Program Review (Alberta Education, 1987d), and for help to be provided for the teaching of ESL students through the content area subjects. Also revealed, as noted by Massey (1985), there seems to be very little in the way of information and materials for integrating ESL and content areas subjects.

I. Respondent Comments Regarding Preferred Type of Curricular Support

A. ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "...include ESL-type units into existing regular curriculum, especially in Math, Language, Social Studies, Literature, Health. A lot of this is done on our own time."

- "The guidelines and suggestions books for the Junior High and Elementary programs are helpful if you are first entering the ESL field and need guidance, which I did 8 years ago. Now I need curriculum. I am not a curriculum writer and frequently ESL students are taught what we think they may need."

- "Support needs to be provided for classsroom teachers and content area teachers in ways that will assist them in working effectively with ESL students while enhancing the learning of English speaking students i.e. schema/concept development, co-operative learning."

B. Non-ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "There is a minimum number of ESL students required before you get help from ESL teachers. I would be interested in using ESL curriculum materials. I was never informed of anything available for teaching ESL in the regular classroom."

C. Counsellor Sample Group

- "Provincial curriculum and local resources have few or no provisions for ESL needs."

4.5 Local Level ESL Program Delivery

4.5.1 Methods of ESL Program Delivery

In order to provide an indication as to the manner in which ESL students are being instructed in Alberta schools, a question concerning program delivery methods was asked of four of the sample groups: a) ESL teachers, b) Non-ESL teachers, c) Special Education teachers, and d) Principals. Seven program delivery methods were listed and described.

The descriptions for the methods were taken from the Alberta Education document entitled "ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs" and are also listed in the Definition of Terms section in Chapter 1 of this study. An eighth category was provided so that respondents could indicate the use of any combinations or variations of the seven listed methods. Table 22 shows the percentages of respondents from the groups surveyed that reported the types of program delivery method used in their schools.

Table 22

Methods of ESL Program Delivery Used in Alberta Schools as Reported by Teachers and Principals

	Sample Groups			
	Teachers			Principals
Program Delivery Method	ESL	Non-ESL	S.Ed.[a]	
n =	89	173	131	134
		(%)		
Reception Class	07	02	01	01
Partial Day Class	13	05	02	07
Withdrawal Program: ESL Resource Room	30	26	29	02
Withdrawal Program: Itinerant Teacher	13	07	13	13
Transitional Class	03	02	01	01
Support Program In Regular Classroom	01	32	52	37
Bilingual Education	00	02	01	02
Other[a]	31	24	32	28

Note: Special Education[a]
Combinations or variations of the delivery methods[b]

Responses from three of the four groups (Non-ESL teachers, Special Education teachers, and Principals) indicate that the most widely used method of program delivery in the schools represented is support within the regular classroom, that is, the Non-ESL classroom.

Of the ESL teachers surveyed, 30% reported the use of the withdrawal program using an ESL resource room, while 31% described the programs in their schools as being combinations or variations of the seven listed methods. It is probable that the former type of program, that is, withdrawal to an ESL resource room, would only be offered in schools where an ESL teacher is employed. This may explain why the ESL teacher group reported this method more frequently than the other groups.

Reception classes, transitional classes, and bilingual education are among those methods which appear to be the least widely used. This situation, where many ESL students appear to be mainstreamed, would allow for the ESL suggestions in content area curriculum guides to be put to good use by Non-ESL staff, reinforcing once again the comments made by Kingwell (1987).

4.5.2 Superintendents' Reports of ESL Program Operation

Superintendents were asked to complete a chart which provided information relating to the operation of programs within the jurisdictions for which they were responsible at the time of the survey. The 88 Superintendents surveyed represented a total of 100 different school divisions, as some of the respondents were in charge of more than one district.

A total of 1232 schools was represented by the Superintendents surveyed. The information gained indicated that 21% of these schools had funded ESL programs and 4% of them were operating programs but were not receiving any special ESL funding from government sources, which indicates that other means of provision for ESL were made within the framework of local budgeting.

Of the 128.6 ESL teachers employed by the divisions represented by these superintendents, 88% were employed in urban jurisdictions, even though 76% of the school divisions represented were rural ones. These particular Superintendents reported that, for the most part, ESL in the rural areas was being taught by teacher aides, special Education teachers, full time and part time aides, and full and part time teachers. It is possible that the appointment of an ESL consultant at the provincial level, as suggested by Kingwell (1987) could alleviate some of the problems experienced by rural school boards that have few ESL staff and resources.

4.5.3 Principals' Reports of ESL Program Operation

Principals were asked to indicate whether or not ESL programs were being operated in their schools, and if there were, then they were asked to give the dates that the programs had been initiated. The data revealed that only 4 of the 29 principals who reported that ESL programs were in operation in their schools were from rural schools. Also, all of the programs, except for one, had been started between September, 1980 and May, 1988.

4.5.4 Consultant Services at the Local Level

All teacher respondent groups were requested to provide information with regard to the availability of consulting services for ESL provided at the local level. They were also asked to estimate the frequency with which they made use of available services.

Table 23 displays the resulting frequency of use of ESL consultant services where they are available. The estimations of how often such services might be used if they were available (but are not at present) are also shown.

An additional category for the estimation was provided for those teachers who were not sure as to whether or not ESL consultant services were available to them. These estimations for frequency of use also appear in Table 23.

Table 23

Availability and Estimated Use of ESL Consultant Services

			Teacher Sample Groups		
Availability/Use		ESL	Non-ESL		Special Education
Available	n =	74	93	(%)	69
never use		04	49		57
rarely use		22	29		22
sometimes use		41	15		12
use fairly often		22	03		06
use frequently		12	03		04
Not Available	n =	10	39	(%)	39
would use if available		90	67		72
would not use if available		10	33		28
Not sure if Available	n =	1	68	(%)	37
would use if available		100	78		76
would not use if available		00	22		37

ESL teachers appear to have the most access to and knowledge of ESL consultant services with 83% indicating that services were available to them. However, 4% of the ESL teachers to whom consultant services were available reported that they "never" make use of such services. Another 22% reported "rare" use, with the bulk of the ESL teachers (41%), indicating that they had contact with an ESL consultant "sometimes".

Only 12% of the ESL teacher group reported "frequent" use of a consultant's services. ESL consultant services were not available to 11% of this particular sample group.

The remaining sample groups, Non-ESL teachers and Special Education teachers, reported ESL consultant services to be somewhat less available. Of the Non-ESL teachers, 38% reported that services were available, and 41% of the Special Education teachers gave the same response. The majority of teachers in these two groups chose "never" and "rarely" for the frequency of use category.

Teachers from all three sample groups to whom ESL consultant services were not available were asked to estimate whether they would use such services if they were provided. Of the ESL teacher group, 90% indicated that they would, and so did 72% of the Special Education group. Of the Non-ESL teachers, 67% reported that they would also take advantage of such services if they were made available to them. Again, Kingwell's (1987) suggestion that there is a need to appoint a provincial level ESL consultant is further supported by the findings of this study.

The figures presented in Table 23 also indicate that a number of Non-ESL and Special Education teachers are "unsure" of the availablity of ESL consultant services and yet indicated that they would use them if any were available.

When ESL consultants were asked to indicate the frequency with which they received requests for help from teachers, school psychologists, and school counsellors, their answers reflected indications similar to those given by the teacher groups for whom consultant services are available. This is displayed in Table 24. The Non-ESL and ESL teacher groups requested help from the ESL consultants most frequently.

Information was also provided regarding the frequency with which ESL Consultants received requests for help with ESL related problems from psychologists and counsellors. Of the ESL consultants surveyed, 50% of them answered in the "never" and "rarely" categories and 40% in the "sometimes" and "fairly often" categories combined, for requests from school psychologists. The school counsellors were reported as requesting help from ESL consultants also, with 50% of the ESL consultants answering in the "sometimes" and "fairly often" categories combined. This indicates that the two respondent groups in question are required to deal with ESL students and that they do use ESL consultant services from time to time where they are available.

Table 24

Frequency of Requests Made to ESL Consultants by Various School Staff Members and Reported by ESL Consultants

			Frequency of Requests			
n = 10	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Frequently	No Answer
Staff Members				(%)		
Non-ESL Teacher	00	20	30	20	30	00
ESL Teacher	10	30	20	10	30	00
Special Education Teacher	00	30	50	20	00	00
School[a] Psych.	40	10	20	20	00	10
School[b] Couns.	20	20	10	40	00	10
Other	50	00	10	10	30	00

Note: school psychologist[a], school counsellor[b]

ESL consultants also reported the approximate number of students for whom they are responsible. Table 25 displays this information.

Table 25

Approximate Numbers of ESL Students for Whom ESL Consultants are Responsible.

Number of Students	n = 10	% of Consultants
Under 100		60
100-300		10
301-500		20
1001-1500		10

The majority of the ESL consultants surveyed reported that they were responsible for 100 students or less. However, a small percentage indicated responsibility for between 1001 and 1500 ESL students.

4.5.5 Primary Responsibility for ESL Students in Schools

Principals, from schools with no formal ESL programs were asked to indicate which staff members assumed the primary responsibility for ESL students in their schools. In addition, the ESL consultants, and EL/A consultants were asked to indicate with regard to their school(s), which staff member provided the majority of language support for ESL students. Tables 26 and 27 reveal that

Principals and ESL consultants see most of the responsibiltiy for ESL students being assumed by the Non-ESL or classroom teacher. These opinions are further confirmed by the data on program delivery methods displayed previously, where three out of the four sample groups involved indicated that the most widely used method of program delivery used in their schools was "support within the regular classroom". Also, since the next most widely used program delivery method reported was "withdrawal" to an ESL resource room it can be assumed that the ESL students are under the care of Non-ESL teachers for all of the time that they are not being withdrawn to a resource room and taught by an ESL teacher.

Table 26

Majority of Language Support for ESL Students as Reported By ESL and E/LA Consultants

Staff Members Responsible	Sample Groups	
	ESL Consultants	E/LA Consultants
n =	10	9
ESL Teachers	40	22
Non-ESL Teachers	10	56
Teacher Aides	20	11
Volunteers	00	11
Others[a]	30	00

Note: Others[a] = eg. Combinations of the above groups.

The E/LA consultants reported that the majority of language support for ESL students is provided mainly by Non-ESL teachers, (56%). The data collected from ESL consultants regarding this issue however, shows a much lower percentage choosing the Non-ESL teachers as providing the majority of language support for ESL students, (10%) and a much higher percentage choosing ESL teachers (40%), as well as teacher aides (20%). This can be accounted for by the indications that, as shown in Table 23 above, more ESL teachers report access to ESL consultants than do the Non-ESL teachers, and that E/LA consultants are likely to have more contact with Non-ESL teachers.

E/LA consultants are responsible for serving regular classroom teachers, so more of their experience will be with this group than with ESL teachers, as the data indicate.

The principals who answered a similar question helped provide indications as to where the primary responsibiltiy for the ESL student lies. The principals who answered represent both urban and rural schools and are in positions which require them to be aware of the exact responsibilities of their staff members.

The principals who provided the data for this particular question were those who reported that no "official" ESL programs were in operation at their schools. Their reports give an indication as to how schools with no ESL programs cope with meeting the needs of ESL students, and it would appear that, according to these principals, the Non-ESL teacher is seen to assume the bulk of responsibility for ESL students. The data concerning this particular question is displayed in the following table.

Table 27
Primary Responsibility for ESL Students as Reported by Principals

Staff Members n = 22	Principals' Reports (%)
Non-ESL Teachers	67
Special Education Teachers	07
Counsellors	01
School Psychologists	00
ESL Teacher	10
Others	15

The above findings concerning both the major responsibility for ESL students and the provision of language support for them reveal that a great deal of responsibility for these areas is being assumed by Non-ESL staff. This reinforces the need for all content area curriculum guides to incorporate ESL teaching suggestions and for a provincial ESL consultant to be appointed to facilitate better communication and to inform all staff of available of ESL resources and information, as suggested by Kingwell (1987).

4.5.6 Time Spent on Direct ESL Instruction in ESL Classes

The ESL teachers surveyed were asked to estimate in hours per week the amount of time they spent giving direct ESL or English language instruction to their ESL pupils. They were asked to provide approximate amounts of time for students at various levels of language competence using the following level definitions as guidelines (Manitoba Department of Education, 1981):

LEVEL 1 - Students with little or no knowledge of English.

LEVEL 2 - Students with English for survival informal situations. These students are able to function in basic oral communication situations, but benefit only minimally from regular classroom instruction.

LEVEL 3 - Students with some English for academic purpose. These students are able to function in the classroom situation, but require considerable assistance.

LEVEL 4 - Students almost fully functional in English. These students are able to function in the regular classroom situation with some assistance, but have still not attained a level of language adequate for their grade level.

LEVEL 5 Students fully functional in English at or above grade level (p.2).

Table 28 displays the resulting information.

Table 28

Average Number of Hours Per Week of Direct ESL Instruction as Reported by ESL Teachers

Level	n = 89	Average Hours Per Week
1		6.52
2		6.17
3		5.02
4		2.46
5		.51

Note: This information applies only to ESL instruction provided by designated ESL teachers.

These reports show that the time spent in direct ESL instruction from an ESL teacher decreases as students attain higher levels of language competence. This also indicates that more responsibility for the education of

ESL students who fall into levels 3 to 5 is likely to be assumed by other staff such as non-ESL teachers. Since those students in levels three and four have still not reached a level where they can function at grade level in English and thus will still require assistance in the regular classroom, it can be assumed that they will have to rely on the classroom teacher and other support staff for help.

One of the ESL teachers surveyed provided a comment which shows how inequality of assistance can occur.

> - "Because I service ESL students in 10 elementary schools, the number of hours of instruction per week is dictated by need but also by time spent in each school and distance between schools. I also have concerns about the inequality of teaching hours (ESL) between the various sections of the city. Students with a resident ESL teacher in the school who receive almost daily assistance are under the same 3 year limit as students serviced by an itinerant ESL teacher who receive a maximum of 1 or 2 hours per week!"

4.5.7 Availability of ESL Teachers in Schools

Non-ESL teachers and Special Education teachers were asked to indicate whether or not there were any ESL teachers in their schools. As Table 29 shows, 74% of the Non-ESL teachers and 79% of the Special Education teachers reported that no ESL teachers were employed in their schools. This indicates that if ESL students were present in many of the schools represented, then the responsibility for them would have to be assumed by one of the two teacher groups mentioned, again indicating a need for content area ESL guidelines.

Table 29

Availability of ESL Teachers in Schools as Reported by Non-ESL and Special Education Teachers

	Teacher Sample Groups	
	Non-ESL	Special Education
n =	242	167
Availability of ESL Teacher	(%)	
Yes	21	17
No	74	79
Not Sure	05	04

4.5.8 Meeting the Special Needs of ESL Students

Information regarding some of the special needs of ESL students and provision being made for those needs was collected from various respondent groups.

I. Gaps in Educational Background

A. Provision of Academic Upgrading

The three teacher groups surveyed were asked to indicate the number of ESL students under their instruction who had missed some years of schooling and if any had, whether or not academic upgrading was being provided for them. The percentages derived from those responses appear in the following table.

Table 30

ESL Students Who Have Missed Some Years of Schooling as Reported by ESL, Non-ESL, and Special Education Teachers

		ESL Students Taught by:		
		ESL	Non-ESL	Special Education
Alternatives				
Have missed some years of schooling	n =	2682	832	240
	(%)	27	06	11
Have missed some years of schooling and are receiving academic upgrading	n =	724	424	27
	(%)	07	04	11
Are not receiving a academic upgrading	n =	724	424	27
	(%)	93	96	89

Note: Academic upgrading[a] = Upgrading provided after school hours or by Saturday schools.

Of the students who receive instruction from the ESL teachers, 27% are reported to have experienced gaps in their educational background, yet only 7% of them are reported to be receiving any sort of academic upgrading.

Fewer of the ESL students who are being taught by the Non-ESL and Special Education teachers are reported to have missed some years of schooling but the percentages of these students who are being provided with upgrading are also extremely low. These data indicate that very few of the ESL students who are reportedly in need of academic upgrading are actually receiving it. These findings support the suggestions concerning the improvement of provision for the special needs of ESL students that were made by the Secondary Education Instructional Program Review Committee, (Alberta Education, 1987d), the Regional Office Zone Monitoring Reports, (Planning and Policy Secretariat, 1988), and Kingwell, (1987).

B. Respondent Comments - ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "Guidelines need to be developed for the placement and programming of students with large educational gaps."

- "We are not meeting the needs of LEP students for academic upgrading..."

- "Many of the students have learning problems that are not directly ESL related. (They have been tested by Multi-Lingual Services - Dr. Yu). Many are illiterate in their mother tongue as they have had no (or very little) education in their homelands."

- "The four students in question/answer #10 have difficulties in language acquisition which in my opinion, are unrelated to second language learning. They are all illiterate or semi-literate in their own tongue and all have had interrupted and/or sporadic educational backgrounds. The special needs of these children, and I'm sure there are many of them throughout our province, must be addressed."

- "Special classes are needed for children arriving here with no educational background - particularly those from Division II on."

II. Special Education for ESL Students

A. Provision of Special Education

ESL teachers and Non-ESL teachers were requested to provide indications as to how many of their ESL students require special education services and how many are actually receiving such services. Table 31 displays the percentages derived from the numbers provided.

Table 31

ESL Students Requiring/Receiving Special Education Services as Reported by ESL and Non-ESL Teachers

		ESL Students Taught by:	
ESL Students		ESL Teachers	Non-ESL Teachers
Requiring Special Education Services	n =	2682	832
	(%)	09	20
Receiving Special Education Services	n =	249	167
	(%)	22	64

Of the ESL students taught by ESL teachers, 9% were reported as requiring special education services and 20% of the ESL students being taught by Non-ESL teachers also were reported as requiring such services. In both cases the data suggest that not all of those students who reportedly needed special education services were receiving them, reinforcing the suggestion that the provisions for meeting the special needs of ESL students be investigated further and that necessary improvements be made.

B. Special Education Teachers' Perceptions of Their Ability to Meet the Needs of ESL Students

Special Education teachers were requested to provide additional information concerning ESL students and special education services. They were asked to do so by indicating how well they felt they were able to cope with certain special needs of the ESL students with whom they work. Table 32 displays this information.

Table 32

Special Education Teachers' Perceptions of Their Ability to Meet the Needs of ESL Students

		Ability to Meet Needs	
Needs	n	Yes	No
			(%)
Special Education Needs	80	81	19
"Gaps" in educational background	65	74	26
No Special Education Needs but do not have enough English to succeed in regular classes	69	62	38
Other[a]	3	100	00

Note: Other[a] = Gaps in North American knowledge and difficulties the students have with teachers and program planning.

Such figures indicate that the majority of Special Education teachers who responded to this question felt most able to cope with special education needs, followed by academic upgrading needs, and least of all, language related ESL needs. Three of the respondents felt able to help ESL students with cultural and school related difficulties. These findings and the comments quoted below show that the Special Education teacher group could play a vital role in the improvement of services for the special needs of ESL students, if more information and guidelines were made available.

C. Respondent Comments Concerning Special Education for ESL Students

ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "We must identify the ones needing special education programs and to provide for them."

- "Some had/have physical problems i.e. malnutrition (both pre-and post-natal), deafness etc. that tend to retard learning. Due to the above factors, many will not succeed in regular academic programs."

Special Education Teacher Sample Group

- "Frequently ESL students end up in special education classes but I don't think that is really what they need.

- "Children at times are placed in special classes because they can't handle regular programs because of ESL factors earlier in their life. They do need an individualized program but do not necessarily meet criteria for the special class. Special class teachers often do not receive support from ESL consultants or teachers because of their low PTR [pupil teacher ratio]. The needs of ESL children are not being met if they end up in special education classes for the wrong reasons."

- "More coordination and cooperation between special ed. and ESL is needed."

III. Psychological Services for ESL Students

ESL and Non-ESL teachers were also asked to provide the number of their ESL students who required help from the school psychologist and the number of their ESL students who are receiving such help. Table 33 displays the resulting percentages.

Table 33

ESL Students Requiring/Receiving Psychological Services as Reported by ESL and Non-ESL Teachers

		ESL Students Taught by:		
ESL Students		ESL Teachers		Non-ESL Teachers
Requiring Psycological Services	n =	2682		832
			(%)	
		04		05
Receiving Psychological Services	n =	116		39
			(%)	
		28		38

The ESL teachers reported that 4% of the ESL students they taught were in need of psychological services and that 28% of that group were receiving them. Of the ESL students taught by the Non-ESL teachers, 5% were reported as requiring psychological services, with 38% of those students receiving such services. These data indicate that not all of the ESL students who are in need of psychological services are receiving them.

School Psychologists were asked to indicate the number of ESL students whom they were seeing at the time of the survey and for what reasons, academic, social, or other. They were also requested to estimate how many of these students they felt they were able to help. Tables 34 and 35 display the results of these questions.

Table 34

ESL Students Referred to School Psychologist for Help with Social and Academic Problems

Reason for Referral	n = 206	% Referred
Social Problems		31
Academic Problems		55
Other		14

The majority of ESL students being seen by school psychologists (based only on those students reported by the school psychologist sample group) were referred for reasons related to academic problems.

Table 35

School Psychologists' Perceptions of Their Ability to Help ESL Students with Academic and Social Problems

		Ability to Help		
Needs	n	Yes	No	Can only help some
			(%)	
Academic Problems	14	79	21	00
Social Problems	8	50	25	25

Note: Reasons given for not being able to help with academic problems included; lack of facilities, and lack of adequate programs. Reasons given for not being able to help with social problems included; lack of knowedge about ESL and especially cultural information, lack of time, and too many problems that require Social Services.

The majority of School Psychologists who are required to help ESL students with academic problems feel able to do so (79%). Half of the School Psychologists indicated their ability to deal with the social difficulties encountered by ESL students.

IV. Counselling Services for ESL Students

School Counsellors were asked to indicate the numbers of ESL students who were referred to them for help with social problems, academic problems, and also career and program counselling. They were also asked to report whether they felt capable of helping ESL students with each of those areas. If they could not help, they were asked to provide possible reasons. The information gained from these questions is displayed in Tables 36 and 37.

Table 36
ESL Students Referred to School Counsellors and Reasons for Referral

Reason For Referral	n = 3472	% of ESL Students Referred
Social Problems		20
Academic Problems		27
Career Counselling		16
Program Counselling		37

Counsellors reported that the majority of the ESL students they are serving at present are being given help with program counselling (37%), followed by academic problems (27%).

Table 37

School Counsellors' Perception of their Ability to Help ESL Students in Various Areas

		Ability to Help		
Reason for Referral	n	Yes	No	Can only help some
			(%)	
Social Problems	108	81	05	15
Academic Problems	114	74	11	16
Career Counselling	90	91	06	03
Program Counselling	113	89	04	07

Note: Reasons given for not being able to help were: language and cultural differences, lack of facilities, and inadequate programs.

Of the Counsellors responding, 89% indicated that they could help ESL students with program counselling, 81% felt able to cope with the social problems of ESL students, and 74% reported that they could help with academic problems encountered by ESL students.

All of the above findings concerning the provision of special education, psychological, and counselling services for ESL students reveal that there are concerned professionals in each area who are capable of meeting a wide range of special needs of ESL students. Also made evident is the need for more information and guidelines to be made available to these staff members in order for the improvement of programming for the special needs of ESL pupils.

4.5.9 ESL Instruction Through Content Area Study

ESL teachers were asked to indicate how often they taught their ESL students through various content areas or subjects. Ten alternatives were listed and the ESL teachers chose a category of frequency for each. Table 38 displays the resulting percentages.

Table 38

Percentages of ESL Teachers Who Teach ESL Through Various Content Areas

Content Areas		How often ESL is Taught Through Each Area				
	n	Almost Never	Not Much	Sometimes (%)	Most of The Time	Almost Always
A	80	34	25	38	04	00
B	79	28	14	54	03	01
C	79	10	16	63	09	01
D	80	01	01	10	45	43
E	74	54	28	19	01	00
F	75	47	32	17	03	01
G	71	46	35	17	01	00
H	75	48	19	31	03	00
I	73	73	12	12	01	01
J	64	81	09	08	00	02

Note:
A Math
B Science
C Social Studies
D Language Arts
E Music
F Health
G Art
H Drama
I Physical Education
J Vocational Education

These data indicate that in the ESL classes represented in the survey, instruction is mainly conducted through Language Arts. Other content area subjects such as Math, Science, and Social Studies seem to be used more often than Art, Music, and the remaining subjects but still to a much lesser extent than Language Arts.

Again, these findings suggest that, as Massey (1985) reported, there appear to be only "isolated efforts" at developing materials and consequently instructing in and through most content area subjects when teaching ESL in Alberta schools.

4.6 Data Relating to the Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming

4.6.1 Respondent Reports on the Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming

As indicated above in the Superintendents' reports regarding the operation of ESL programs, a certain impact is being made by the ESL funding policy on the ability of school divisions to provide ESL programming where it is needed. Additional information was obtained from this sample group and others, which points to the September 30 cut-off date for grant applications as contributing to the difficulties of operating adequate ESL programs, an issue raised in the Regional Office Monitoring Summary Report (Planning and Policy Secretariat, 1988). The findings also indicate that the three year limit on funding for ESL students may not be long enough to allow for the needs of all such pupils to be met, as reported by Collier (1987), especially since different types of program delivery methods are in use.

I. The Superintendents Sample Group - Comments Regarding The September 30 Cut-Off Date and Three Year Funding Limit

The Superintendents made a number of comments regarding the issues of the cut-off date for the submission of grant applications and the three year limit on funding and the problems they pose for those in charge of setting up and running ESL programs. A sample of these comments appears below.

> - "Current funding is inadequate for small numbers in rural areas. As well, help is needed immediately -we cannot wait until September to start programs when students arrive mid-year."
>
> - "There should be an additional count date for students. Note that in X approximately 80 students arrived this year after the count date of Sept. 30, 1987."
>
> - "We have 24 students in 12 different schools so we can't group them for instruction. We try to provide aide time to each school for tutoring either individual or pairs of students. We also provide appropriate ESL materials to each school. Teachers often have ESL kids in their classes after Sept.30 and it is difficult for us to provide inservice support for them. Also the funding we receive does not begin to cover the support services we provide. The Sept. 30 cut-off does not represent the reality - at least not in our system as students appear throughout the year."
>
> - "We do not keep figures for the large number of students who are beyond the three year funding limit and who therefore do not receive direct ESL assistance. These students may be receiving assistance in the form of modified programs, extra instruction etc. provided by teachers outside the ESL program."
>
> - "Funding for three [ESL] children will not be available in 1988-89, as they will be in their 4th year. Some could continue to use help."

> - "The integration of ESL students into the regular program as quickly as possible is essential; however often these students require ongoing support. A program which is funded for three years may not be adequate for all students."

II. The ESL Teacher Sample Group - Reports and Comments Regarding the Three Year Funding Limit

ESL teachers reported that of the ESL students in their care who had been receiving more than 3 years ESL instruction 25% were not considered to be achieving at the appropriate grade level as of June 30,1988 and would require further instruction and assistance after that time. These teachers also made comments regarding this issue. A selection of these comments follows.

> - "The three year funding limit is inappropriate. All studies indicate that literacy in a second language on the average takes 7 years."
>
> - "Also it is N.B. to look at amount of time three year funding may be in reality. I have students who are only receiving 1 hour 1 week who should have much more but this is impossible if there is only one student in the school."
>
> - "Recognize that within the three year funding limit that services to students are not equal. One student may receive ESL instruction for a full day or half day every day and another may receive help for one hour twice a week because of where he/she lives and the number and range of levels served by an itinerant ESL teacher.
>
> - "There are many ESL students in the high school system that [sic] need additional support, tutoring and continued ESL classroom time [beyond three years].

- "3 years is an inadequate amount of time as many of the students require academic upgrading to be mainstreamed in the academic high school program."

III. Principal Sample Group - Comments Regarding the Three Year Funding Limit

- "In terms of language acquisition theory and practice, 3 years is an insufficient period of time to ensure individual student development within the context of the broader culture."

The comments cited above strongly support the suggestions made by concerned educational bodies and mentioned previously, that three years is not always sufficient time for all ESL students to become proficient in English, and that the September 30th cutoff date for submission of grant applications does impair the ability of some school boards to provide adequate ESL programming.

4.6.2 Resident (Alberta Born) ESL Students

A. Percentages of ESL Students in ESL, Non-ESL, and Special Education Classrooms who are Alberta Born

Information was requested from the teacher sample group respondents that would provide an indication as to the numbers of pupils for whom they were responsible who were ESL students. The respondents were first asked to state the total number of students for whom they were responsible and then, out of that number, the number of students who did not speak English as their first language, or who were considered ESL students. Percentages of ESL students under the care of ESL, Non-ESL, and Special Education teachers were computed from the resulting numbers. Table 39 displays this information. It also shows the results gained from another question which sought to discover the approximate number of ESL students who were born in Alberta, and would therefore be considered "resident" ESL students.

Table 39

Percentages of ESL Students Taught by Three Teacher Sample groups and Percentages of those ESL Students Who were Born in Alberta

Teacher Sample Groups		% Students ESL		% Students in "A" Born in Alberta
	n	A	n	B
ESL	4191	57	2386	13
Non-ESL	17559	04	688	57
Special Education	4127	06	238	55

ESL teachers reported that only 57% of the students they teach are ESL, indicating that some of these teachers must also be required to teach Non-ESL students. Of the 57% who are ESL students and are being taught by ESL teachers, 13% were reported as having been born in Alberta.

Non-ESL teachers indicated that 4% of the pupils they teach are ESL students. Of those ESL students, 57% were reported as having been born in Alberta.

Special Education teachers reported that 6% of their pupils were ESL students and that of that percentage, 55% were born in Alberta. These figures support the suggestion made by Kingwell (1987) and others (Planning and Policy Secretariat, 1988), and illustrated by the definitions of ESL students from the United States and other Canadian provinces, that consideration should be given to resident ESL students in curriculum and program planning for ESL in Alberta. The data that follow give some indication as to the factors contributing to the type of programming which may be required for resident ESL students.

B. Origins or Language Groups of Resident ESL Students

A question was asked of the three teacher groups concerning the origins of the ESL students in the classes who were born in Alberta and are therefore considered to be "resident" ESL students. The resulting data appear in the appended Table A-2 and respondent comments relating to this issue follow.

ESL teachers reported that only 8% of their resident ESL students belonged to a Native Canadian language group, for example, Cree or Blackfoot, and that less than 1% were of Hutterite/Mennonite German background. The majority of resident ESL students taught by ESL teachers represent "other" origins such as Vietnamese, Chinese, as well as other groups.

When Non-ESL teachers were asked to indicate the origins of their ESL students, they reported that 59% were Native Canadians, 10% were of Hutterite/Mennonite German background, and 31% represented "other" origins.

Special Education teachers reported that 63% of their resident ESL students were of Native Canadian origin, 2% were of Hutterite/Mennonite German background, and 35% represented "other" origins.

III. Respondent Comments Concerning Resident ESL Students

Principal Sample Group - Hutterite Colony Schools

- "Hutterite colony students speak English as a second language! They should receive a different type of instruction using appropriate materials and specially trained teachers in a low pupil-teacher ratio setting."

- "Nothing will change unless the provincial government earmarks funds for ESL instruction in colony schools and makes them available to local school boards."

- "This is my second year of teaching at a Hutterite Colony school. The teaching situation is most often regarded as special because of the cultural distinctiveness but I am becoming more and more aware of the English as a second language aspect of the specialness. Very few materials really suit the combination of both the cultural and language differences from the 'norm'."

Superintendent Sample Group

- "ESL provision for students from non-English speaking countries is too restrictive in that it does not recognize resident cultural and/or ethnic groups within Alberta whose children enter schools with no or at best very limited ability to function in an English environment. Although cultural adjustment may be less severe for resident students the language problem for resident pupils is comparable to that of immigrant students and must be addressed by the receiving school. It is our strongly held opinion that differentiation based on place of origin is not justifiable."

- "We have 5 Hutterite schools in the county in which ESL is taught to incoming students by the regular teacher."

- " Consideration needs to be given to situations involving Hutterite Schools."

ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "Where do Native students fit into the ESL picture? Many Natives come into our schools with ESL yet I am not sure that they are treated in the same manner as other ESL students."

- "We do need, however, services for two other groups of children whose severe language deficits hold them back in acquiring good reading and writing skills. These children are our Native Indians and children who are Canadian born but come from homes where English is second. They can often pass the initial screening but fail to have a rich enough language base to excell as they should."

- "The fact that a child was born in Alberta has no bearing on whether or not he can speak English. Most of my students are raised in homes where they never hear English. Even the T.V. plays tapes in their first language. They need ESL just as much as the immigrant child. They both speak no or very little English when they start school."

School Psychologist Sample Group

- "Another group that perhaps need a closer look is the Native Indian. Some speak a Native Language and are clear examples. Others may have a mixture of languages or perhaps only speak English but [it] is very poorly developed."

Special Education Teacher Sample Group

- "Students of Native Ancestry who are either ESL or ESL should be classified as ESL with access to funding from the Department of Education."

- "I believe very little resources have been directed at developing course materials and an approach suitable for the needs and background of the Canadian Natives."

- "The only student I see is a Native Canadian with Cree as her first language. [She is] missing or lacking a wide variety of social experiences which presents difficulties when reading content and pleasure materials."

Non-ESL Teacher Sample Group

- "We could especially use some help with Native students as the success rate is very, very low."

- "There is only one Native Indian child in my remedial language arts class who is not classified as an ESL student, but who has some difficulty with the English language."

- "In the school division where I work...the majority of ESL students are Native Canadian. They are provided with some services but not necessarily in the area of language development."

Both the figures and the quotations cited above show that the Native Canadian and Hutterite/Mennonite students have ESL needs and that teachers need materials and information that is culturally as well as instructionally appropriate in order to address the specific needs of these two students groups.

4.6.3 Early Childhood Services and ESL

The percentage of teachers surveyed who were working at the ECS level was very low (see Table 4). As a result, the best data provided concerning Early Childhood Services and ESL came from the written comments that were made by a number of survey respondents. These have been taken directly from the questionnaires and appear below.

They indicate that there is a good deal of concern among teachers and other school staff about the need to address the issue of some sort of provision for the needs of ESL children at the ECS level. This finding reinforces similar concerns that were voiced by Cummins (1986), Kingwell (1987), and those of a number of other researchers whose suggestions were presented in Chapter Two of this study. Further confirmation of the importance of this issue appears with the personal interview results discussed in a subsequent section of this study.

I. Respondent Comments Concerning ESL at the ECS Level

ESL Teacher Sample Group

> - "From the various research articles, discussions with ESL colleagues across Canada, and evidence from ECS/ESL programs; I am very concerned that we in Alberta do not fund these students in order for them to receive ESL support at this vital age. I understand from Federal projections, [that] there will be continuing numbers of Canadian born children entering ECS programs throughout Alberta, unable to communicate in English. Apparently the percentage of these students may reach overwhelming proportions within the next 5 to 10 years. This is a situation we must address as we plan for the future in this province. Perhaps piloting some experimental approaches to indeed see what is the best approach may help us provide our own research. Thank you for taking the time to understand our programs and listen to our concerns."

School Counsellor Sample Group

> - "Attention to ESL sudents at the elementary level would be a far more productive response to their needs than reactive and substitutive strategies at the secondary level."

Principal Sample Group

The principals involved in the mail-out survey were asked to write out their own definition of an ESL student. Of the principals, 128 did so and their definitions revealed perceptions of the ESL student which relate to both the resident ESL student issue and to the question of

ESL programmming at the ECS level. Out of the total number of principals who provided definitions, only 27 (or 21%) made any mention at all of ESL students having to be born outside the province of Alberta, or even Canada.

With regard to the ECS question the data are even more strongly suggestive of the need to recognize ESL needs at this level. Only one of the principals excluded the ECS child from his definition. Instead, terms such as "any student who...", and "all students who..." were used frequently by the principals when describing those individuals whom they see as being ESL students.

The following definitions reflect the tone and content of the rest of the principals' reports of what they consider to be accurate descriptions of ESL students.

- "A student whose deficiency in English is such that he or she is unable to participate in ordinary conversation, convey his/her thoughts in written form or understand instruction in a classroom setting."

- "Those who are not yet sufficiently familiar with the English language to function in English in the daily oral or written work required at their grade level."

- "Any student whose first language is not English and requires additional language instruction in order to succeed in the regular school programme."

- "One who is not able to communicate in English or French. One who is learning English as a second or third language."

- "Star Ridge is a Hutterite colony school and all students learn English as a second language and German as a first language. Many students enter school with little or no spoken English and a limited understanding of English. They all qualify to some extent."

- "A student whose native tongue is not English and who does not have enough English (written/spoken to read) to communicate effectively within the school setting and beyond the school setting in writing, reading, or spoken formats."

- "Any student requiring special assistance in learning English as a second language so that they can follow instruction in English in the classroom."

- "Include all students who speak a non-standard form of English or whose first language or language of the home is other than English and who score within a given range on a set of tests as prescribed by the ESL team of the X Board of Education."

- "Every child who comes to school has German as their primary language. These students only hear, speak, or write English from 9:00 to 3:00. At all other times they speak German."

- "Students with a second language background are tested for proficiency in syntax, listening, comprehension, vocabulary and reading. They receive ESL support if they are 2 or more years below grade level on these language tests."

These data underline the need for curriculum and resources to be developed for ESL students at the ECS level and to be made available to all teachers and staff who teach such students. The Hutterite colony teachers exhibited a high degree of need for help with their ECS students, students who have very real ESL needs.

4.7 Teacher Training and Professional Development in ESL

4.7.1 ESL Related Courses taken by Teachers

The teacher respondents were asked a question related to their teacher training that concerned possible coursework taken in areas that would have been beneficial to them had they been required to work with ESL students in any capacity. All three teacher sample groups were asked to indicate areas related to ESL in which they had taken one or more courses. The following table displays the responses given by each of the groups.

Table 40

Courses Related to ESL and Taken by Teachers

Course Subject Area	ESL	Non-ESL	Special Ed.[a]
	Teacher Sample Groups		
n =	89	244	170
		(%)	
English/Language Arts	84	69	82
English as a Second Language Teaching	65	04	12
Linguistics	64	29	32
Second Language Teaching Methods	46	06	09
Multicultural/Cross-Cultural Education	40	10	19
None of the Above	04	29	12

Note: Special Education[a]

A high percentage of all three teacher groups has had some training in the area of English or Language Arts. This may be accounted for by the fact that it has been compulsory for teachers training via the elementary route to take at least one such course at the undergraduate level. However it should not be assumed that these courses are designed to prepare teachers for second language teaching. A course in the area of Language Arts may impart some skills and knowledge which may prove transferable to some aspects of ESL teaching but one should not assume that a course in an area such as English literature would do the same.

English/Language Arts courses are certainly not a detriment to someone who encounters ESL students in their classroom, but at the same time, one or two such courses would only make a marginal contribution toward preparing a teacher to deal with the needs of ESL students. Thus, these high percentages in the English/Language Arts area must be analyzed with caution, and careful consideration must be given to their actual import.

The number of Non-ESL and Special Education teachers who have had training in the remaining four areas is considerably lower. Higher percentages of the ESL teachers have taken courses in all five of the areas mentioned. Although a number of this group reported that they have taken courses in ESL teaching (65%) only 40% have taken multicultural/crosscultural education related courses.

These findings indicate that there is room for improvement in the education of teachers who are likely to encounter ESL students at some point in their careers. Of special concern is the area of multicultural/crosscultural education, a subject area in which many teachers across Canada were unconcerned about at the time of the Acheson and Newsham study (1978). The data presented above confirms that deficiency of training in this important area still exists in the province of Alberta.

4.7.2 ESL Inservice Attendance for Teachers

The three teacher groups were also requested to indicate whether or not they had ever attended an ESL inservice of any kind. The responses given appear in the table below.

Table 41

Teacher Attendance at ESL Inservices

		Teacher Sample Groups		
Attendance		ESL	Non-ESL	Special Education
	n =	89	239	167
			(%)	
Yes		96	07	19
No		04	93	81

Of the ESL teachers surveyed, 96% indicated that they had attended ESL inservices. The number of Non-ESL and Special Education teachers who have attended ESL inservices is dramatically lower. Only 7% of the Non-ESL teachers surveyed have attended professional develpment activities dealing with the teaching of ESL students. At 19%, the Special Education teacher group is not much higher. It is evident from this information that Alberta's teachers, especially those who are not ESL trained, are not benefitting from ESL inservicing and the type of support and experience mentioned by Thompson (1986).

4.7.3 Respondent Comments Regarding Teacher and Staff Preparation for ESL

Comments regarding the training of staff for dealing with students who have ESL needs were made by a number of respondents and are quoted below.

Non-ESL Teacher Sample Group

> - "I definitely need help with these students in the classroom. We cannot run a separate program or hire such a teacher unless complete funding would be available. Therefore, I need to learn how to help them within the regular classroom."
>
> - "This survey has made me realize that services and support materials are available but I do not know of or [how] to make good use of such options. Perhaps a better communication between ESL experts and classroom teachers concerning diagnosis and remedial options would help."

ESL Teacher Sample Group

> - "It is unrealistic to expect [classroom] teachers to develop special programs for ESL students. However, they have been most receptive to workshops when I have presented the above two strategies [schema/concept development, and cooperative learning] because they see it as improving their teaching skills for all students."

School Counsellor Sample Group

> - "The average high school English teacher has not been inserviced for ESL."
>
> - "Part of their [ESL students] problem is exacerbated by teachers ill-prepared to meet their needs."

- "While it is essential for the ESL students to be integrated into a regular high school program, most high school teachers are not prepared for the demands and/or needs these students present."

Special Education Teacher Sample Group

- "ESL inservice would be useful for classroom and special education teachers. I have never heard of any inservices being offered on this topic. I feel that many of the techniques/strategies etc. would be useful to students who are not ESL but have language deficits."

- "I think ESL teaching inservices/conferences would be beneficial to all teachers who were interested, but particularly special education teachers...everything out of the normal, ordinary realm of teaching seems to fall on us."

- "Resource Room teachers must have [ESL] inservicing and workshops available to them."

The above comments reinforce the data displayed above and once again point to the need for Alberta's teachers to be provided with professional development activities designed to help them to deal with the needs of ESL students.

4.8 Personal Interview Results

The data collected through the personal interviews were analyzed and the information relating to the areas of focus for this research has been compiled according to those areas and appears below. The issues raised have been organized in point form and some direct quotations from the interviews are also included.

4.8.1 Provincial ESL Curriculum Development

Several of the interviewees mentioned curriculum and resource development for ESL, and made particular reference to the needs of the students they represented.

I. Interviewee - Principal of a rural school where the population is largely Native

- "Native students "need to be given a strong base in the English language."

II. Interviewee - Teacher from an urban school where the population is largely Native

- "More material with Native content is needed."
- Maintenance of Native students' Mother Tongue should be of major importance.

III. Interviewee - Teacher from a rural school where the population is largely Native

- ESL needs are especially severe in isolated Native communities

- "The more programming that you can get that would be more related to their [Native ESL students] life experiences would probably be very beneficial."

- "One of the biggest problems for the Cree native [is that] there aren't very many stories that are available for kids to read that are just specifically about Cree people."

IV. Interviewee - Native Language consultant from a Rural School Board

- Mother tongue teaching needs to be done in order for Native ESL students to grasp concepts in English.

- "The ESL needs of [Native students] are quite different from the needs of immigrant children..."

V. Interviewee - ESL Teacher from a Large Urban Board

- There is a need for "Native content books and pictures" which portray "situations they [Native ESL students] are familiar with so that they can discuss..."

VI. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal from a Hutterite colony school

- There are "no documents available" [to him] for teaching ESL to Hutterite children

VII. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal from a Hutterite colony school

- "I haven't seen the [Alberta Education ESL] documents."

VIII. Interviewee - University Professor of Education

- Hutterite children do not have the contextual and experiential background to understand English stories and other materials in addition to lacking English language skills.

The need for ESL curricula and materials that are appropriate for both Native and Hutterite children, and that draws on their respective "experiential backgrounds" is stressed once again in the statements quoted above and reinforces the data collected in the mail-out survey and discussed earlier in this study.

4.8.2 Local Level ESL Program Delivery

Comments were also made by some of the interviewees regarding local level program delivery for ESL.

I. Interviewee - ESL Teacher/Native Language Consultant with a large urban board

- Using school developed materials, programs combining language arts and [Native] cultural education are operating in three schools. These programs for Native ESL students were "made because of demands by parents." The children are "taken out 2 to 3 times a week [to] work on language arts skills but the content is strictly cultural and out of their interests." The results seem positive as "attendance has improved and they enjoy them."

II. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal of a Hutterite colony school

- He is "going to be placed under the jurisdiction of another elementary school" in his division.
- Hutterite children in his school attend German school from 8:00 to 8:30 (am) and 4:00 to 4:30 (pm)
- He has an aide to assist him.

III. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal of a Hutterite colony school

- "The multi-grade situation and ESL needs make it hard."
- "I have a full time teacher's aide, I have 28 children now (had 30 but lost 2 when they turned 15), I have children from 5 to 15 years old."

The ECS and ESL needs of Hutterite school children, coupled with the multigrade situation, increases the burden placed on the often isolated Hutterite colony teachers, as indicated by Piper (1986). The above statements confirm this and reinforce the need for ESL materials, information, and inservicing to be made available to all teachers who work in colony schools.

4.8.3 Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming: ESL for Resident and ECS Students

This area of concern was mentioned by a number of the interviewees, especially with reference to the Resident ESL student issue and the need for ESL at the ECS level to be recognized and provided for.

I. Interviewee - Principal of a rural school with a large Native population

- "There is a need at ECS to expose them [Native students] to English."
- "... you have to recognise them [Native students] as ESL."

II. Interviewee - ESL Teacher/Native Language Consultant with a large uraban board

> - "Most [Native] students have difficulty in the early primary grades - many kids are detained either in ECS or grade one or grade two because their language skills are deficient and they're not as expressive verbally."

III. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal of a Hutterite colony school

> - The children who come to the colony school at 5 and 6 years of age know "very few words in English".
>
> - There is a need for ESL help in colony schools, especially at the ECS level.

IV. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal of a Hutterite colony school

> - "The first couple of months of grade one are pretty rough for the children and for me. They can be and are sometimes from 6 months to a year behind..."

V. Interviewee - University Professor of Education

> - She is worried about the teachers in Hutterite colony schools because they have to deal with ESL needs and they are often operating with "no support at all".

4.8.4 Teacher Training and Professional Development for ESL

I. Interviewee - Representative for ESL from Alberta Education

- "The strength of any program lies in the teachers who operate it."

- "Teachers who know how to deal with second language acquisition and all the strategies that go with it do a good job."

II. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal from a Hutterite colony school

- There have been "no inservices or workshops" for ESL that he knows about.

III. Interviewee - University of Calagary Professor of Education

- "...a lot of what a teacher witnesses in a Hutterite colony runs counter to everything she's been taught, because she's a product of this culture [outside the colony]."

IV. Interviewee - Teacher/Principal from a Hutterite colony school

- "Most counties do not include Hutterite Teacher/Principals in the meetings and the dissemination of the information has not been very good. I have never been to an ESL inservice - didn't know I could. The southern part of the province has the largest number of Hutterite schools and thus are [sic] more advanced than the northern ones."

V. Interviewee - ESL teacher from a large urban board

> - "If a teacher is going to be involved in teaching of Native children I think it's important that they also become familiar with the culture. I think this would help a lot and also finding different avenues of presentation."

The above comments show that teacher education for ESL is considered to be a very important issue by those individuals interviewed and that more attention should be given to improving the way in which all teachers are prepared for meeting the needs of ESL students.

4.9 Summary

The data collected in the mail-out survey and personal interviews have contributed to the investigation of the major areas of concern outlined at the start of this study and discussed in the literature review. The results of the data analysis have been used to address the research questions posed earlier. This has in turn been used to build a better description for ESL curriculum development and program delivery in Alberta.

The following chapter contains conclusions and recommendations that were arrived at based on the information collected. It also addresses the issues arising from this work which warrant further research in the future. In addition, the researcher has reflected on the study and suggests modifications which might have been made to it.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has provided insight into the nature of programming for English as a second language education for elementary and secondary students in the province of Alberta. It has done so by collecting reports, perceptions, and opinions about certain aspects of English as a second language programming from individuals who are directly involved in the provision of content and language education and support services for students with ESL needs.

The information gained from the mail-out survey and personal interviews has been used to answer the research questions posed earlier. The results both contribute to a better understanding of how ESL programming is carried out in Alberta's schools and point to certain measures which could be taken to improve the educational situation for ESL students in the province.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the conclusions drawn from the results of this investigation and to make recommendations for change to certain aspects of ESL curriculum development and program delivery. In addition, ways in which this study might have been improved and suggestions as to the direction which future research in this area might take, are also included.

5.1 Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions and recommendations concerning the four major areas of concern which have provided the focus for this research are listed below and have been categorized according to those areas.

5.1.1 Provincial Level Curriculum Development

The questions concerning curriculum development for ESL at the provincial level covered: (a) the adequacy of existing ESL curricular support materials, (b) the availability/accessibility of existing provincial ESL curricular support materials, and (c) the type of provincial ESL curricular support materials most needed by school personnel.

I. Adequacy and Availability/Accessibility of Existing Provincial ESL Curricular Support Materials

A. Conclusions

The survey and interview data indicate that in terms of adequacy the existing provincial ESL curricula (support documents, course manuals etc.) are considered to be "good" by the majority of those school personnel who have access to them, and who are, for the most part, ESL teachers. However, the documents are not as accessible and well known as they need to be, as many teachers and other staff have never heard of them and many schools do not even have them available for their personnel. Even the most general of the documents, the ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs, which would be most helpful to any school with ESL students, seems to suffer from being neither well known, nor well distributed.

Hutterite, Special Education, and Non-ESL teachers were among those who expressed a special concern over having no idea that any curricular materials were available which would assist them in dealing with the needs of ESL students, in spite of their need for such material. A number of these individuals reported that they had been unaware of the existence of ESL curricula before being made aware of it in the survey and interviews conducted for this research, and many of them submitted urgent requests for information on ESL curricula and resources. A certain desperation was exhibited in these requests, as the respondent comments in Chapter Four of this study reveal.

The knowledge of sources where ESL resources can be obtained was also very low among those staff who were not ESL teachers. Again, many staff need to be informed as to the availability of sources for resources such as the school board ESL resource centres, and Alberta Education ESL documents if they are to meet the needs of the ESL students in their care.

A. Recommendations

Based on the reports and perceptions of the educators surveyed and interviewed, the following recommendations regarding the availability of curricular support materials for ESL are made:

1. That provincial level ESL representatives and local school boards work to ensure that principals, teachers, and other school staff, in both urban and rural jurisdictions are made aware of the availability of all provincial level ESL curricular support materials and sources of ESL resource materials, and are informed as to

how to procure them.

2. That a special effort be directed toward providing teachers in Hutterite colonies and teachers who work in isolated rural communities where there are large numbers of Native students with all provincial level ESL curricular support materials and sources of ESL resource materials.

II. The Type of ESL Curricular Support Materials Most Needed by School Personnel

A. Conclusions

Indications were provided by various respondent groups as to the type of curricular support for ESL that they feel would meet their needs as educators who are, or could be, responsible for ESL students.

The teachers and consultants surveyed, especially E/LA Consultants, and the Non-ESL and Special Education teachers, were strongly in favour of the inclusion of ESL teaching suggestions in all content area curriculum guides.

Those who are ESL trained, that is, ESL teachers and consultants, feel that a program of studies is also required. Certain respondents also expressed the opinion that there is a need for such suggestions and/or curricula to address the language and cultural needs of Hutterite and Native ESL students and to take into consideration their experiences and backgrounds, which differ a great deal from each other, and from those of most immigrant ESL students.

B. Recommendations

1. That English as a second language teaching suggestions be incorporated into all content area curriculum guides so as to aid all teachers and support staff in helping ESL students to learn in and through content, that is, both to learn subject matter and to acquire language through the study of subjects such as mathematics and social studies, regardless of whether or not ESL programs and specialists are available.

2. That efforts be made both at the provincial and local levels to develop and circulate suggestions for meeting the second language needs of Hutterite and Native ESL students, whether through making sure that the provincially prepared curricula are made appropriate for teaching these groups or by some other means such as the development and distribution of special pamphlets or suggestion booklets designed specifically for addressing the ESL needs of these students.

5.1.2 Local Level Program Delivery

I. Conclusions

Survey responses from superintendents, principals, teachers, and other support staff have provided information which contributes to a more complete picture of the way in which ESL programs are being administered in elementary and secondary schools in Alberta. Two of the important findings made with regard to local level program delivery concern are: (a) the type of program delivery most often employed, and (b) the personnel who assume the most responsibility for educating ESL students.

The data gained from other questions concerning this area of focus help to describe other aspects of program delivery as well, such as: (a) the use and availability of ESL teachers and consultants, (b) the time ESL students spend studying English and learning through content in their ESL classes, and (c) how well the special needs of ESL students are being met. In addition, principals and superintendents provided information which gives some indication of the type of jurisdictions where funded ESL programs are most likely to be operating. Since these aspects of programming are so highly interrelated, a set of recommendations based on the following conclusions appear at the end of this subsection.

A. Most Widely Used Type of Program Delivery Method for ESL

The type of ESL program delivery method most widely reported as used in the schools represented by the survey respondents was that of support within the regular, or non-ESL classroom, where the non-ESL teachers would be expected to assume the major responsibility for the progress of the ESL students. ESL teachers also indicated that withdrawing ESL students to a resource room is done fairly often in the schools where they teach. Other forms of program delivery such as transitional, bilingual, and reception classes are among those least widely used.

B. Locations of the Funded ESL Programs Operating in Alberta

Very much related to the type of program delivery employed by schools is the availablity and nature of funding for ESL, which enables schools to set up and operate programs. The data obtained from both principals and superintendents indicates that the provincially funded ESL programs are operating almost entirely in urban areas. Urban school districts also employ the majority of ESL consultants and ESL teachers, whereas in rural areas other non-ESL staff and teacher aides must work with ESL students more frequently, often without any additional ESL support services.

C. Primary Responsibility for ESL Students in Alberta Schools

As the data on program delivery methods indicates, the individuals who appear to assume the primary responsibilty for ESL students in the schools surveyed are the non-ESL, regular classroom teachers. In urban areas, where ESL teachers and consultants are much more widely available to provide support, and where ESL resource centres are more common and accessible, classroom teachers are less likely to be alone in shouldering the responsibility for ESL student, even if official ESL programs do not exist in all of their schools. Rural teachers, especially those teaching in isolated regions and on Hutterite colonies, are often left very much on their own to deal with the needs of resident ESL students.

D. Time Spent on Direct ESL Instruction in ESL Classrooms

Students who are fortunate enough to be enrolled in ESL classes do not always receive the same amount of direct ESL instruction. Specific teaching techniques aside, there are other factors that influence the length of time that ESL teachers are able to spend giving direct ESL instruction to their ESL students. For instance, the type of ESL program being operated will influence whether or not the ESL teacher is based in one school or has to travel between several schools, serving a larger number of ESL students and sometimes being forced to spend less time with each student. Also, similar inequalities may be created by some schools employing their ESL teachers on a part time basis because of budgetary constraints, or requiring ESL teachers to assume some non-ESL teaching responsibilities as well, thus preventing them from spending greater amounts of time with ESL students.

The data gathered in this survey indicate that such conditions do exist and that as a result it must not be assumed that all ESL students who are funded are receiving the same level of ESL instruction.

E. Time Spent teaching English through Content in ESL classes

When ESL students are learning English from an ESL teacher in Alberta, the question of how frequently they are doing so in and through content area study is of interest. Reports provided by the ESL teachers surveyed for this research indicate that while in ESL classes, ESL students are being allowed to learn English mostly through studying language arts. Other content areas such as social studies, science, and mathematics are also used but to a much lesser degree. Fine arts subjects such as music and drama are used even less, as are physical education, health, and vocational education.

Although the use of content area instruction other than language arts is being used somewhat to teach ESL, it does not appear to be extremely widespread.

F. Provision for the Special Needs of ESL Students in Alberta

This study was able to provide information on the various special needs of ESL students and indications as to how attempts are being made to meet those needs. The areas investigated included: (a) academic upgrading, (b) special education services, (c) psychological services, and (d) counselling services.

The need for ESL students who have missed some years of schooling because of conditions such as political unrest, war, and time spent in refugee camps in their original countries, to receive academic upgrading of some sort was reinforced by the teachers surveyed and interviewed for this study. Their reports indicate that not all of the ESL students who have special needs for academic upgrading are receiving the necessary services. Saturday schools conducted in some of the various mother tongues or heritage languages appear to be the main source of help for ESL students who need to make up for lost years of education, and this clearly is not an adequate provision, especially since the focus is on the preservation of the heritage language and culture rather than on academic upgrading.

Teachers in Alberta are of the opinion that some kind of provision must be made for all ESL students who are in need of academic upgrading, as there is at present little if any means of helping them make up for lost years of education. Only if such upgrading is provided will these children begin to benefit from the ESL instruction which will prepare them for content area instruction in English.

The survey reports also indicate that not all of the ESL students whom teachers feel require special education services are actually receiving them. However, most of the special education teachers surveyed do feel that they are able to meet the special education needs of the ESL students they serve and that they also are able to help somewhat with academic upgrading and to much lesser degree, the second language needs of ESL students.

The Special Education teachers appeared to be one of the most concerned groups surveyed. They made many comments, and offered suggestions and opinions as to how they feel ESL programming can be improved. In addition to making other suggestions (which appear in the curriculum and teacher training sections of this study), they feel that they could provide better service for ESL students if there were more links between their members and members of the ESL teacher group.

ESL students also receive help from school psychologists, mainly for reasons relating to academic problems. The majority of the school psychologists surveyed felt that they were able to help with the academic problems for which ESL students were referred to them. They dealt less often with the social concerns of ESL students and also felt less capable of doing so.

School counsellors also provide aid to ESL students for such things as program counselling, help with social problems, and academic concerns. They feel that they are most able to help with program counselling, followed by social problems and least of all, academic concerns.

It is obvious from the data gathered concerning some of the special needs of ESL students that there is a very good potential network of specialists prepared to help in any way that they can. The main difficulties in making such a network operate smoothly and efficiently seem to be a lack of communication between the various groups involved, and lack of support and knowledge for those individuals who are willing to provide services for ESL students but are not as well informed as they might be.

Also, in some instances ESL students who require certain services are not, for some reason, receiving them. This is occurring in spite of the fact that there are specialists available who feel capable of providing a variety of support services to classroom and ESL teachers.

II. Recommendations

Based on the reports, perceptions, and opinions of the respondent groups surveyed, the following recommendations concerning local level program delivery for ESL are made:

A. That an effort be made at the local level to improve communication between schools that have ESL pupils and between the ESL teachers/consultants and other non-ESL teachers and support staff. This is especially important in rural areas where ESL support services are spread very thinly.

B. That an effort be made at the local level to provide information about the nearest available ESL support services (that is, ESL consultants, teachers, resource centres, etc.) to those schools in rural areas where such services are not common and where teachers most often need assistance in order to meet the needs of resident ESL students such as Native and Hutterite children.

C. That an effort be made at the local level to promote better communication between Non-ESL and ESL teachers so that programs can be designed to provide a good balance of education in content areas and English language skills for all ESL students in the time that is available.

D. That effort be made at the local level to promote better communication between ESL teachers/consultants, and the staff who provide special education, psychological, and counselling services so that the latter can provide the most appropriate help for ESL students in both urban and rural settings.

E. That initiative be taken at the local level to ensure that adequate academic upgrading be made available to all ESL students who require it.

F. That a provincial level ESL Consultant be appointed to aid local school boards across the province in the efforts to promote better communication and to improve the dissemination of ESL information, as mentioned above.

5.1.3 The Impact of Funding Policy on ESL Programming

The survey and interview data gathered for this study indicate that provincial level funding policies do have an important impact on the provision and nature of ESL programming, particularly at the local level. Several aspects of ESL funding policy were investigated for this research and the information gained serves as a basis for the following conclusions concerning; (a) the September 30th cut-off date for the submission of grant applications for ESL, (b) the three year funding limit on ESL grants, and (c) the exclusion of resident and ECS students from the provision of ESL assistance.

I. Conclusions

A. September 30th Cut-Off Date

The funding policy restriction which prevents the submission of grant applications for ESL assistance after September 30 inhibits schools in their efforts to develop and operate ESL programs. Long range planning, which includes recruiting staff, allocating space, ordering materials etc. is especially difficult when students arrive throughout the year, many after the September cut-off date, with no funding being available for them until the following school year.

B. The Three Year Limit on ESL Funding

Responses collected from the respondent groups and interviewees for this research strongly reinforce the suggestion that many ESL students require longer than three years of ESL support if they are to be prepared to meet the academic challenges of unassisted English instruction at their appropriate grade levels. Variance in program delivery and ESL teacher allocation in addition to differing background and needs among ESL pupils further supports the idea that the strict three year limit is not suitable for the situation.

C. ESL for Resident and ECS Students

The survey and interview data collected for this study show that there are many teachers, support staff, principals, and superintendents who are struggling to meet the ESL needs of resident students such as Hutterites and Native Canadians without provincial ESL funding support.

Some school boards make provision for resident students by diverting other funds. Under other circumstances, such as those experienced in Hutterite colony schools, teacher/principals are left alone with few, if any, appropriate resources and with no access to funds for materials, workshops and other necessary components.

If ESL funding were available for resident students then the local school boards would be in a better position to provide the necessary ESL support services, resources, and other forms of assistance to the teachers and students who obviously are in need of them. In addition, ESL curricular materials could be improved so that they would cater to the unique needs of the resident ESL student as well as to those of students who were not born in Alberta.

The question of whether or not ESL support is needed at the ECS level was addressed by a number of respondents and interviewees. They were definitely of the opinion that some sort of instruction aimed at developing language skills at the ECS level, in a mother tongue, English, or a bilingual situation needs to be provided so that ESL students will have fewer problems when they reach the upper elementary and junior high grades. If funding were provided for this group, then the type of instruction most appropriate for their needs could be investigated by ECS and ESL specialists, and programs could be planned accordingly.

II. Recommendations

Based on the reports, opinions, and perceptions provided by the individuals who were surveyed and interviewed for this research, the following recommendations with regard to issues related to ESL funding policy are made:

A. That support be given at both local and provincial levels for the recommendations made by Hunt and Wyllie (1988) regarding the ESL funding policy, with respect to the September 30 cut-off date, the three year funding limit, and the inclusion of resident and ECS students in the definition of an ESL student.

B. That teachers and other concerned personnel at the local level begin working on the planning and development and/or modification of new and existing resources and programs for ESL which would provide for the needs of resident ESL students and for ECS students who have ESL needs.

5.1.4 Teacher Training and Professional Development for ESL

ESL teachers, Non-ESL teachers, and Special Education teachers all provided data which indicates their degree of

ESL related training and their participation in ESL professional development activities. Conclusions and recommendations regarding the issues of teacher preparation and inservicing for ESL follow.

A. ESL Related Courses Taken by Alberta Teachers

The survey data suggest that out of the three teacher groups surveyed, the ESL teachers had the greatest amount of training or coursework in all of the areas related to ESL that were mentioned on the survey forms, that is: English/Language Arts, ESL teaching methods, Linguistics, Second Language teaching methods, and Multicultural education. Although fairly high numbers of individuals from the Non-ESL and Special Education teacher groups had training in English/Language Arts related courses, and a somewhat lower number reported some Linguistics training, very few had taken any courses in ESL or Second Language teaching methods or in Multicultural/Crosscultural education. Less than half of the individuals in the ESL teacher group reported that they had taken one or more courses in this latter category as well.

In agreement with the findings of Acheson and Newsham (1978) cited earlier, these data suggest that Alberta's teachers are not receiving the training at the University level that will prepare them to deal with the language and cultural needs of ESL students whom they may encounter. It was also revealed that they are especially lacking in training that promotes awareness and understanding of cultural differences.

Although some ESL teachers possess years of experience in dealing with ESL students, experience which could contribute to an equal, if not better degree of cultural awareness and knowledge of language acquisition than merely one or two courses, the value of providing all prospective teachers with some form of training in areas related to ESL is apparent.

B. Teacher Attendance at Professional Development Activities for ESL

ESL inservices provide an excellent opportunity for those with ESL experience and training to share their ideas and discoveries with non-ESL staff in order to promote a better understanding of the needs of ESL students, how to best meet those needs in the regular classroom, and where to obtain additional help and resources. The data gathered in this survey indicate that the attendance of non-ESL staff at such inservices is distressingly low. Additional comments made by many of the non-ESL respondents displayed an extreme need for inservice assistance for dealing with the needs of ESL students. This need is especially urgent in areas where few, if any, ESL personnel are available for consultation, and where ESL resource centres are nonexistent. A large number of respondents insisted that non-ESL staff need to be provided with regular professional development activities for ESL if they are to be of any assistance at all to the ESL students in their care.

The results of this research indicate that Non-ESL and Special Education teachers, as well as other school personnel, need to be better informed with regard to ESL teaching, and that many of them would be eager and willing recipients of any inservicing that might be provided by local or provincial ESL personnel. This issue also reinforces the need for better communication between ESL and non-ESL staff mentioned earlier in this chapter.

II. Recommendations

Based on the reports, opinions, and perceptions of the individuals surveyed and interviewed for this research it is recommended that:

All prospective teachers be made aware of ESL and multi/crosscultural courses available to them at university and that they be encouraged to take such courses, especially if they are interested in teaching in areas where large populations of ESL pupils attend school, such as in isolated Native communities, in Hutterite colony schools, and in large urban centres.

B. Provincial and local level ESL representatives work together to coordinate better and more comprehensive professional development activities for non-ESL staff accross the province, especially in rural and isolated areas and for teachers in Hutterite colony schools, so that eventually all teachers and support staff in the province can have access to ESL inservices.

C. Concerted effort be made by members of the Alberta Teachers of English as a Second Language Association to inform non-ESL staff in schools across the province of their existence and services.

D. Non-ESL staff be encouraged by their principals and other ESL staff to join specialist councils of the Alberta Teachers' Association which deal with ESL, second language and multicultural education issues.

5.1.5 Summary

This research has produced results which contribute to the overall profile of the present state of ESL programming in Alberta. It has done so by allowing members of one ESL stakeholder group, that is, individuals responsible for the delivery of educational services to ESL students, to report on a number of different aspects of the nature of ESL programming and to voice their own personal concerns as to the quality of that programming. These responses have reinforced and verified some of the comments and suggestions made by educational bodies and individuals, and presented in the earlier chapters of this study, as well as prompting the recommendations listed above.

5.2 Changes That Might Have Improved this Study

With hindsight, there are some aspects of this study which, had they been done differently, might have improved the quality of the work. They are listed below.

I. Alternative Method of Choosing Certain Respondents

The method by which ESL teachers, ESL consultants, and E/LA consultants were chosen did not guarantee the same degree of randomness as the method used for the other sample groups. The responsibility for choosing respondents and for relaying questionnaires and information was entirely in the hands of intermediaries. This meant that delays in passing on letters and information of which the researcher would have had no knowledge may have occurred.

In addition, when some of these respondents failed to return their questionnaires, the researcher was again dependent on the intermediaries and had no way of checking to ensure that the respondents in question were indeed receiving letters and additional questionnaires.

As a result, there was a slightly lower response rate among the ESL teachers than might have been hoped for. Although the rate was considered acceptable because of the back-up information received from ESL teacher interviewees, it still would have been better to have had a higher rate of response from this important group. The ESL and E/LA consultants responded more readily, and this may be because they are often in contact with central offices and with those personnel who were chosen to be intermediaries, unlike the ESL teachers who could be spread across the school division in various schools.

There may also have been unintentional bias on the part of the intermediaries who chose the ESL teachers.

For example, they may have picked ESL teachers who have higher profiles, making the sample less random than it might have been. If so, there may have been a "type" of ESL teacher who was not represented and who may have had very different views to express.

Changes to design which may have prevented the problems mentioned above could have been implemented had time permitted. For example, since no random computerized list of ESL teachers, consultants, and E/LA consultants is available, various school boards could have been asked to submit the numbers of ESL teachers in their employ, along with the names and addresses of the schools where they worked. Direct communication could then have been carried out with the ESL teachers, doing away with the need to use intermediaries.

It would have been necessary to do this well in advance of the survey so that the teachers would not have missed receiving the pre-survey letter. This type of planning would likely have averted any problems related to communication with the ESL teachers and the possible bias associated with the selection procedure used. Such measures, had they been implemented, could well have contributed to a higher response rate and more equitable representation for the ESL teacher group.

II. The ECS Issue

With hindsight, it is evident that more specific information from ECS specialists alone would have been a positive contribution to the research, and would possibly have revealed more about the attitudes of ECS teachers who have ESL students in their classes. As the sample of Non-ESL teachers was random there was no way of determinig the numbers of ECS teachers who would be included in that group (even though a larger sample was taken from the Non-ESL group in an effort to increase the numbers of ECS teachers). As a result, only a very small percentage of the Non-ESL group were teaching at the Kindergarten level. The data that was gathered from the survey and the interviews contained information which did indicate that ECS students with ESL needs should be recognized and assisted, but more specific questions about the type of instruction that ECS and ESL teachers feel is appropriate would also have been of interest.

III. Amount of Data Collected

The amount of data collected in the survey and interviews was quite large and yielded a great deal of information. The time required to record, process, and analyze that information could have been shortened by either: (a) narrowing the scope of each questionnaire and asking fewer, more specific questions while still meeting the requirements of the research objective, or (b) taking samples from fewer population groups.

The collection of additional data that was required by the organization which funded this study resulted in extra time and effort being expended in dealing with data that was extraneous to the research objectives. Still, additional efforts to keep the focus as narrow as possible would have made positive contributions to the overall design.

IV. Personal Interview Structuring

The personal interviews might have yielded more specific information if they had been more highly structured. This might also have restricted the interviewees however and prevented them from feeling at ease in the discussion. It is possible that an approach that was only slightly more structured would have been sufficient to tighten up the interviews without removing the relaxed atmosphere.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research

In addition to contributing to the profile of ESL programming in Alberta, this study has raised a number of questions which could be pursued in future studies concerned with aspects of curriculum development and program delivery for ESL. A selection of some of the possible questions which could be addressed follow, along with suggestions as to how they might be pursued by other researchers.

I. ESL for Hutterite Children

What are the special ESL needs of students attending Hutterite colony schools in Alberta?

- Survey research projects could be conducted, where all teachers in Hutterite colony schools would be interviewed or surveyed as to their perceptions and opinions.

- Observational research projects involving the study of various aspects of second language learning/acquistion of single students, small groups of students or whole populations of colony schools, could be conducted, centered in the Hutterite colony classrooms.

- The resources and programs developed by Hutterite colony schools in southern Alberta could be investigated, their development traced, and their relative success evaluated through comparative testing.

- The issue of the purpose for which Hutterite children must learn English could be investigated from a philosophical standpoint, and perhaps suggestions as to the most appropriate type of ESL assistance could be a product.

II. ESL for ECS Students

A. What type of language instruction do Alberta ECS and ESL teachers feel is most appropriate for ESL students at the ECS level?

- the survey method could be employed to investigate, compare, and contrast, the opinions and perceptions of ECS and ESL teachers about the value of various methods of ESL teaching at the ECS level, such as, bilingual, mother tongue only, and English immersion.

B. How do ESL children who have been exposed to different ECS educations such as those mentioned in A, above, compare in terms of language acquisition and ability to cope with subsequent grade levels in school?

- Case study research could be conducted over a two to three year period with several ESL students.

III. Program Delivery for ESL

A. What factors determine the type of ESL program delivery method adopted by rural and urban school districts?

- Further investigation could be done by using the survey research method and interviewing superintendents and principals.

B. Who is in the best position to provide academic upgrading for ESL students and under what conditions could this be done to maximize existing personnel and resources at the local level?

- Several school districts could be examined with regard to the ways in which the issue of academic upgrading is addressed, then the results of each examination could be compared. ESL students receiving academic upgrading in different settings could then be tested, and the tests compared.

IV. Further Contributions to a Programming Profile for ESL in Alberta

Finally, the profile of ESL programming in Alberta could be extended by the collection of the reports, opinions, and perceptions of other groups of individuals who are members of ESL stakeholder groups and those findings compared with the results of this study. ESL students, their parents, teacher aides and volunteers could contribute valuable information about ESL curriculum development and program delivery from very different perspectives than those investigated in this research. This would help to create a more comprehensive view of the way in which Alberta schools deal with the education of students who speak English as a second language.

5.4 Summary

This research has yielded descriptive data concerning the nature of curriculum development and program delivery for ESL in Alberta. The information contained in the study contributes to the possible development of an overall "ESL Programming Profile" which could be used by educational planners at both local and provincial levels to increase educational opportunity for ESL students in urban and rural schools in Alberta.

The results of this study have reinforced some of the suggestions and recommendations set down by other researchers, interest groups, and educational bodies as well. This proves significant in itself, in that it may bring the issues in question to the fore and attract the attention of those individuals who are in a position to initiate positive changes to the less successful aspects of current programming.

Few individuals would dispute the suggestion that all students, whatever their educational requirements, are entitled to equal opportunities in education. Provincial governments and local school boards display intentions which centre on the provision of sound, comprehensive programming, programming that doesn't discriminate between student groups. Yet, despite such intentions, there is still a great deal of room for program improvement in terms of equality of instruction.

Careful and effective planning must occur in order for the needs of ESL students in Alberta schools to be met by the existing educational system. Before such planning is undertaken, a better understanding of the complexity of current ESL programming needs to be gained. This study can be viewed as a step in that direction.

REFERENCES

Acheson, P., & Newsham,G. (1978). *English as a second language in Canada.* Montreal: Centre for the teaching of English as a second language, Concordia University.

Alberta Education. (1987a). *General policy manual.* (pp. 2, 111-18). Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1987b). *English as a second language: 10A basic English.* Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1987c). *English as a second language instruction in the elementary school: curricular guidelines and suggestions.* (p.vii). Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1987d). *The secondary education instructional program review. Language arts.* (pp.22-29). Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1988). *English as a second language instruction in the junior high school: curricular guidelines and suggestions.* (p.vii). Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1988-89). *School grant schedule.* Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1986). *School grants manual, part 2, section 14, June.* (p.1,3a). Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1982). *ESL/D Guidelines and suggestions for the administration and organization of programs.* (pp.8, 41-61) Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education. (1981 unpublished). *File 2555-3, ESLCCC Membership.*

Ashdown, Jane. (1982). Practical hints for coping with limited English in the early childhood classroom. *Multicultural Education, 4* (3), 9-10.

Babbie, Earl R. (1973). Survey research methods. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company Inc.

Bain, Bruce. (1981). English as a second language needs assessment: Alberta hopes. (pp. 47-48) Edmonton: Edmonton Public Schools.

Baker, Reena. (1982). Multiculturalism in community based classes. Manitoba Modern Language Bulletin, 16(3), 1-4.

Best, J.W. (1986). Research in Education (5th edition). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Longman.

Betkowski, Nancy. (1988). News Release. (p.1.) Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Borg, W.R., and Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.

Bradburn, N. M., and Sudman, S. (1980). Improving interview method and questionnaire design. London: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1981). ESL/D resource book for K-12. (p.3) British Columbia: Curriculum Development Branch.

Brunner, Bernie. (1981). Status report: Provincial developments in English as a second language. (p.1). A presentation to the director of the Language Services Branch, October 14.

Burnaby, Barbara. (1986). Language for Native, ethnic, or recent immigrant groups: What's the difference? Summaries of Sessions of the 8th Annual ATESL Conference. (pp.1-30). Edmonton: ATESL.

Bussiere, Adrien. (1984). Letter from September 19. Unpublished.

Bussiere, A., and Tardiff, D. (1986 unpublished). Changes proposed to the ESL policy. Summary of discussion

Cates, Ward Mitchell. (1985). A practical guide to educational research. New Jersry: Prentice Hall Inc.

Chamot, Ana Uhl. (1983). Toward a functional ESL curriculum in the elementary school. TESOL Quarterly. 17(3), 459-471.

Collier, V.P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. TESOL Quarterly, 21 (4), 617-41.

Cote, Lawrence S. et. al. (1984). The much maligned mail survey reexamined: A comparative analysis of procedures and techniques to increase response rates. Speeches/Conference papers (150). Chicago Il. Association for the Study of Higher Education. (EDRS Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 967)

Cummins, Jim. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. Harvard Educational Review. 56 (1), 18-36.

Derrick, June. (1977). Language needs of minority group children in infant schools. (pp.31-51). Berkshire: N.F.E.R. Publishing.

Dillihunt, Vivian. C. (1984). Tactics and factors that increase response rates to mailed questionnaires. Information Analysis (070). (EDRS Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 789)

Dillman, D.A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys. The total design method. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.

ESLCCC File (1981). ESLCCC Membership File - 2555-3. Edmonton: Alberta Education

Fradd S. (1985). Governmental policy and second language learning. The Educational Forum. 49(4), 431-440

Galfo, A. J. (1983). Educational research design and data analysis: An integration approach. New York: University of America Press.

Gass, J.R. (1985). Immigrant's children at school. (pp.1-3). Washington, D.C.: Centre for Educational Research and Development.

George, J. (1987). ESL/D guidelines, intermediate and senior divisions. (p.8). Ontario: Ministry of Education, Curriculum Branch.

Hoegel, Juergen. (1985). Early childhood education for L.E.P. children. (pp.7, 28-29). Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education.

Hunt, K.L., and Wyllie, D. (1988). English as a Second Language: The Situation in Alberta's Schools Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Kingwell, G. (1987, November). Summary of Discussion Letter containing a summary of a meeting between Calgary ESL teachers and an Alberta Education Representative. Calgary, Alberta.

Massey, Michael. (1985) Directions in ESL curriculum. The Canadian Modern Language Review. 42(2) 263-270.

McLeod-Risseeuw, S. (1987 October). Letter Written to the Language Services Branch of Alberta Education. Edmonton, Alberta.

Mohan, Bernard A. (1987). Language and content learning: Finding common ground. Alberta Modern Language Journal. 25(1) 22-25.

Mother tongue teaching. (1982). Great Britain. National Union of Teachers Publications. (p.3).

Ohio State Department of Education (1983) Strategies for developing language programs for national origin minority students. (p.6). Columbus: Ohio State Department of Education.

Patrie, Jamie. (1985). Proficiency testing of ESL students. Elements. xvi(2), 14-17.

Phair, Michael. (1986). 1986 Immigration to Alberta, Ages 0-18, (Report). Edmonton: Career Development and Employment.

Piper, Terry. (1986). TESL for Hutterite Children. ATESL Newsletter. 7(4), 6-7.

Planning and Policy Secretiariat. (1988). *Regional offices of education zone monitoring reports for 1986-87.*

Province of Manitoba, Department of Education. (1981). *Language development handbook for students with limited proficiency in English.* (p.1). Manitoba: Department of Education.

Province of Manitoba, Department of Education. (1984). *Language development handbook for secondary students with limited proficiency in English.* (p.1). Manitoba: Department of Education.

Summaries of Sessions. (1986). The 8th Annual ATESL Conference. Edmonton: ATESL.

Toohey, K. (1985). English as a second language for native Canadians. *Canadian Journal of Education.* *10*(3), 275-293.

Wakefield, Patricia. (1985). *Demonstration preschool ESL project.* (Report,Sexsmith Preschool). (pp.1-16). Vancouver, B.C.: The University of British Columbia Child Study Centre.

Wyatt, J. (1982). Western Canadian educators respond to ESL needs. *The Canadian School Executive.* 21-23.

Appendices

Appendix A

Table A-1, English as a Second Language Enrolments

Table A-2 Origins of Resident ESL Students as Reported by ESL, Non-ESL, and Special Education Teachers

Table A-1

ENROLMENTS – ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGAGE - 1986-87

Number of Pupils by Grade

OPERATOR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
THIBAULT RCP #35					1	1						
ST. ALBERT PS #6	2	2		1		1	1					1
DRAYTON VALLEY RC #111				1	2		2	1				
YELLOWHEAD DIV. #12	2											
WAINWRIGHT DIV. #32	1	5			3							
COUNTY OF WETASKIWIN #10	1		1	1								
COUNTY OF LEDUC #25				3		1				1	1	
COUNTY OF LAMONT #30		1	1									
LLOYDMINSTER DIV.	1		1	1								
COUNTY OF PARKLAND #31							2					
COUNTY OF STRATHCONA #20	5	4	1	2	1	2	1					
COUNTY OF MINBURN #27				1								
COUNTY OF BEAVER #9	6	4			1	2	1		1	1		
SHERWOOD PARK RC #105	1											
EDSON RC #153					2				2	3		
LETHBRIDGE RC #9	7	8	9	9	16	9	3	5	5	4	4	8
MEDICINE HAT DIST. #76	11	7	1	6	5	3		9				
LETHBRIDGE DIST. #51	16	17	16	4	14	5	9	6		9	11	8
COUNTY OF NEWELL #4			1									
TABER DIV. #6	6	4	4	6	3	4	1	1	1			
BANFF DIST. #102	2	1	2	1								
COUNTY OF MOUNTAINVIEW #17	3		1		2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
MT. RUNDLE DIV. #64					1							
RED DEER RC #17	1	1	1	2		1						
RED DEER DIST. #104	6	5	4	4	4	3	6	1	2	8	7	7
CAMROSE DIST. #1315	2	1		1								
PROVOST DIV. #33			1	1			1	2				
ST. ALBERT DIST. #3		1	1									
WESTLOCK RC #110	2	2	1	1				1		1		
FORT MCMURRAY RC #323	3	2	1	2	3		1	3	1	1	1	3
COUNTY OF BARRHEAD 111	1	2		1	1		1		1		1	
NORTHLAND DIV. #61	5		2	1		1		1				
GRANDE PRAIRIE RC #28	1	1	1	1		2						
FORT VERMILION DIV. #52	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1			
FAIRVIEW DIV. #50	6	2	2	2	1	1						
LEGAL DIST. #1738											1	1
MEDLEY DIST. #5029	11	16	14	15	11	10						
EDMONTON RC #7	56	58	39	43	29	27	30	24	15	55	29	8
CALGARY RC #1	83	44	29	30	31	21	18	30	24	36	3	2
EDMONTON DIST #7 *	215	132	92	85	81	53	63	61	57	101	62	20
CALGARY DIST. #19	374	213	132	111	94	66	109	89	103	169	120	28
GRAND TOTAL	831	534	359	338	306	215	251	236	208	390	241	86

GRAND TOTAL: 3995

* Estimated enrolments by grade

Table A-2

Origins of Resident ESL Students as Reported by ESL, Non-ESL, and Special Education Teachers

	ESL Students Taught by:		
Origins	ESL	Non-ESL	Special Education
		(%)	
n =	316	388	134
Native Canadian	08	59	63
Hutterite/Mennonite	00	10	02
Other	92	31	35

Note: Resident ESL students are those who were born in Alberta

Appendix B

ESLCCC Mandate, (1981-09-01)

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE COORDINATING COMMITTEE

MANDATE

The mandate of this committee is related to planning, developing and piloting activities of programs and/or curriculum prepared for students of English as a Second Language. It consists of:

1) identifying the needs of pupils in urban and rural school jurisdictions in Alberta as they relate to English as a second language;

2) establishing priorities for curricular activities on the basis of information obtained from the needs identified in No. 1;

3) reviewing proposed administrative guidelines for English as a second language to provide feedback to the Language Services Branch on the proposals;

4) assisting the Language Services Branch in preparing curricular guidelines for Alberta schools in which there are students learning English as a second language;

5) identifying other curricular issues and concerns and making appropriate recommendations to the Curriculum Policies Board;

6) establishing and monitoring the work of English as a Second Language Ad Hoc and Learning Resources committees.

Appendix C

Letter, Re: The Five year Plan for ESL

Letter: From Dr. B. Brunner
        To Mr. A. Bussiere
        September 16, 1981

2555-2, Vol. 1

English as a Second Language:

FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR ESL

- Learning outcomes for students (objectives by grade levels)
- Testing materials and procedures, i.e.:
    - -- standardized testing

      Leading to program implications
    - -- psychological testing
- Implementation of program components, i.e. inservice.
- Cultural
    - -- sensitization
    - -- awareness
- Orientation package for ESD/ESL families
- Resource for orientation package for various educational audiences
- Develop set of recommendations for Secondary Education institutions.

- Bilingual Education -- for whom?
- Approaches to reception of children.
- Approaches to the provision of services (i.e. administrative procedures).
- ESL in the community school
- Accreditation of high school courses
- Use of paraprofessionals and multicultural workers
- Identification and selection of learning resources (May 1981)
- Become familiar with ESL documents.
- Address issue of multicultural education in the schools.

Appendix D

The ESLCCC Five year Plan for ESL

5. FIVE YEAR PLAN

Dr. Lamoureux stated that the plan must be more specific so that it will be of greater use to the Branch.

In five years we will have realized the ideals to ensure that the E.S.L./D. student will have access to the same educational opportunities available to other students. The following statements were accepted as ideals:

1) Every school will accept an ESL/D student as an individual who is an integral member of its student body and adapt its programs to help each child reach his/her potential.

2) Whatever language and culture a child brings to us is to be regarded as a positive and enriching factor benefiting the individual as well as the total school community.

To acheive the above ideals, the following actions were deemed necessary:

1) All teachers are to feel comfortable and receptive to teaching students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

2) All teachers are to have acquired the knowledge and skills necessary to teach ESL/D students.

6.OTHER BUSINESS

8.4) National Broadcasts in ESL

Suggestions:

a) programs for non-ESL students focusing on emotions of ESL students

b) instructional programs

c) experiences of children in different cultural settings

d) world events followed up by comments from those involved

e) serialization of the book, "The Forces Which Shaped Them," by Mary Ahsworth.

8.4) INTERFERENCE

James Patrie expressed concern about a conflict between Alberta Education personnel (i.e. the role of Alberta Educaiton ex-officio members) and ESLCC committee members. This concern will be put on the agenda an discussed at the next meeting with all persons present.

Other agenda items will be discussed at a later meeting.

7. PRESENTATION BY GUESTS

Roman Petryshyn of Alberta Culture made a presentation on the role and responsibilities of Alberta Culture and on the ways in which they could be of assistance. Following his presentation, it was suggested that information about Alberta Culture should be included in our final handbook.

Bernie Brunner is to forward a copy of the Alberta Heritage Council submission, "Minority Language Rights in Alberta," to each member of the ESLCC.

Catherine Thompson from Settlement Services provided information on the services available from her Department. She also presented information on immigration levels for 1982: Alberta receives 20% of the refugees and 15% of the immigrants who enter Canada.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Barbara Toye-Welsh and Nora Yellowknee were nominated to form a sub-committee to complete the summary of activities and the flowchart from the work done by the committee on specific activities for the five-year plan.

The committee reviewed definitions of an ESL student submitted by the Administrative Guidelines and Curricular Guidelines Committees.

James Patrie moved that the following Administrative Guidelines Ad Hoc Committee definition of an ESL student be accepted as the working definition for the ESLCC and sub-committees:

> An ESL student is one whose first language is othr than English. Due to this fact, the ESL student's progress may not be commensurate with his age and/or abilities. As such, this student requires additional support services in the regular program of studies.

The motion was seconded by Barbara Toye-Welsh and carried unanimously.

Jill Wyatt moved that a definition for English as a Second Dialect be included as part of the working definition for the ESLCC and sub-committees. Motion seconded by Gordon Mitchell. Carried unanimously.

Jill Wyatt also moved that the following definition of an ESL/D student be accepted:

> An English as a Second Dialect student is one whose dialect is sufficiently different from that used in Alberta schools so as to inhibit his/her progress.

The motion was seconded by Gordon Mitchell and carried unanimously.

Bernie Brunner distributed three needs assessment instruments for reaction. Committee members are to review them and provide feedback at the next meeting.

Appendix E

Copies of Pilot Study Letter and Thank-you Note

Alberta
EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L2

April 14, 1988

To: ESL Pilot Questionnaire Participants

You have been selected to pilot a questionnaire developed by Alberta Education to assess English as a Second Language program needs in Alberta. Your input will be used to improve the validity of the survey instrument that is being developed for this purpose. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire indicating the time it took you to fill out the form in the space provided at the top left hand corner of the first page. Any suggestions you might have regarding the improvement of this questionnaire would be very much appreciated. A comment sheet is provided for this purpose.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathryn L. Hunt

Kathy Hunt, ESL Consultant

Diane Wyllie

Diane Wyllie, ESL Consultant

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

Dear

We would like to thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to complete the pilot questionnaire developed for the ESL needs assessment. Your prompt attention to this matter was greatly appreciated. The comments and suggestions that you contributed have been most helpful!

Sincerely,

Kathryn L. Hunt
Kathryn Hunt

Diane Wyllie
Diane Wyllie

Appendix F

Table F-1, Pilot Study Response Rates

Table F-2, Pilot Study Evaluation Results

Table F-1

Pilot Study Response Rates

Sample Group	# Sent	# Returned	Response Rate (%)
Non-ESL Teachers	10	08	80
ESL Teachers	10	08	80
Special Education Teachers	10	06	60
Total	30	22	73

Table F-2

Pilot Study Questionnaire Evaluation

Aspect of Format Evaluated	% Indicating				
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Spacing of Questions	00	05	25	50	20
Wording of Questions	00	10	35	40	15
Size of Print	00	05	25	50	20

Appendix G

Copies of Questionnaires for Mail-Out Survey

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

MAY 1988

Note: ESL = English as a Second Language
N/A = Not Applicable

1. Please check off your **one main** area of specialized training.

a) English/Language Arts ☐
b) Mathematics ☐
c) Physical Education ☐
d) Social Studies ☐
e) Music ☐
f) Science ☐
g) Business Education ☐
h) Art ☐
i) Vocational Education ☐
j) Second Languages ☐
k) Administration ☐
l) Special Education ☐
m) Other(Please Specify) ☐

____

2. Please check the grade level group which you are teaching or working with at present.

a) N/A ☐

b) ECS(K) ☐

c) 1 - 6 ☐

d) 7 - 9 ☐

e) 10-12 ☐

3. How does your school help students learn English if their first language is not English? Please check the one alternative which best describes what is done in your school.

a) ☐ RECEPTION CLASS -These students receive intensive instruction from an English as a second language teacher all day. The students remain with this teacher prior to being placed in regular classes.

b) ☐ PARTIAL DAY CLASS - These students spend part of the day in an English as a second language designated school and the rest of the day in regular classes in a school that is not ESL designated.

c) ☐ WITHDRAWAL PROGRAM: ESL RESOURCE ROOM - These students are withdrawn from regular classes periodically to go to an English as a second language resource room. In regular classes these students are able to take part in subject areas having low language demand, ie. physical education and art.

d) ☐ WITHDRAWAL PROGRAM; ITINERANT TEACHER - The English as a second language teacher travels to schools and withdraws those students who need help.

e) ☐ TRANSITIONAL CLASSES - An English as a second language teacher works with the classroom teachers to partially integrate these students into regular programs (ie. social studies, math etc.) where language and content have been modified.

f) ☐ SUPPORT PROGRAMS WITHIN A REGULAR CLASSROOM -These students remain in regular classrooms. English as second language teachers, consultants, tutors, teacher aides, interpreters, special education teachers,and guidance and counselling personnel, give support to classroom teachers.

g) ☐ BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM - These students receive some instruction in their first language.

h) ☐ Other (Please specify) (eg. Combinations or variations of the above)

____

____

____

4. Please check the area(s) in which you have taken one or more courses.

a) Multicultural/Crosscultural Education ☐

b) English as a Second Language Teaching ☐

c) Linguistics ☐

d) Second Language Teaching Methods ☐

e) English/Language Arts ☐

f) None of the above ☐

5. Have you ever attended English as a Second Language Inservices?

yes ☐

no ☐

6. Please check the **one** type of curricular support document that you feel is **most** needed for teaching students who do not speak English as their first language.

a) ESL program of studies ☐

b) General guidelines and suggestions ☐

c) English as a second language teaching suggestions incorporated into all subject area curriculum guides ☐

d) Other (Please specify) ☐

____

e) N/A ☐

7. a) Do you have an English as a Second Language Teacher in your school?

yes ☐
no ☐
not sure ☐

8. How useful have you found the following sources of information regarding resources for use with students who do not speak English as their first language?

	0 never used	1 poor	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
a) Your school board ESL resource centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Recommended resources from consultant	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) General Subject Area Curriculum Guides	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) English/Language Arts Curriculum Guides	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) ESL documents from Alberta Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Other (Please describe) ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

____

9. What is the total number of students you are working with or teaching at present? (i.e. Non-ESL and ESL combined). ☐

10. Out of the total number of the students that you are working with or teaching at present, how many do not speak English as their first language? (i.e. are ESL)(Please give a NUMBER not a percent)

☐

11. Out of the total number of those students mentioned in number 10 (ie. ESL), how many belong to each of the following language groups? Please print the number(s) in the appropriate box(es). Please use a "0" to indicate those groups not represented by your students.

a) N/A
b) Chinese
c) Vietnamese
d) Korean
e) Japanese
f) French Canadian
g) East Indian
h) German (European)
i) German
(Hutterite, Mennonite)

j) Native Canadian
(eg. Cree, Blackfoot)

Of this number, how many speak a Native Canadian language (eg. Cree, Blackfoot) as their first language?

k) Portuguese
l) Spanish
m) Arabic
n) Polish
o) Russian
p) Cambodian
q) Laotian
r) Other (Please Specify)
____
____

12. a) Out of all of your students, how many speak English as their first language but speak a NON-STANDARD DIALECT OF ENGLISH? (eg. Jamaican).

b) Of the number in a), how many were born in Alberta?

13. To the best of your knowledge, were any of those students mentioned in number 10 (ie.ESL) born in Alberta?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

i) If yes, how many students? ☐

ii) Please identify the language groups for those ESL students who were born in Alberta by putting the number of students in each box. Please use a "O" to indicate those groups not represented by your students.

a) Chinese ☐
b) Vietnamese ☐
c) Korean ☐
d) Japanese ☐
e) French Canadian ☐
f) East Indian ☐
g) German (European) ☐
h) German (Hutterite, Mennonite) ☐
i) Native Canadian (eg. Cree, Blackfoot ☐

j) Portuguese ☐
k) Spanish ☐
l) Arabic ☐
m) Polish ☐
n) Russian ☐
o) Cambodian ☐
p) Laotian ☐
q) Other(Please Specify)
________________ ☐
________________ ☐
________________ ☐

14. To the best of your knowledge, have any of those students **mentioned in number 10 (ie. ESL)** missed some years of schooling because of war or political unrest etc. in their native country?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

c) don't know ☐

If yes,

a) How many students? ☐

b) Of those students in (a) do any receive academic upgrading? (eg. literacy in Mother tongue etc.)

yes ☐ How many? ☐

no ☐

don't know ☐

If yes, please describe how this academic upgrading is provided.

____

____

____

____

15. Are ESL consultant services available to you?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how often do you use these services?

1	2	3	4	5
never	rarely	sometimes	fairly often	frequently
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

b) no ☐

c) not sure ☐

If no or not sure, would you use English as a second language consultant services if they were available?

yes ☐ no ☐

16. Have you used the document ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how useful did you find it?

1	2	3	4	5
poor	fair	good	very good	excellent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

b) no ☐

If no, please indicate the one best reason why you have not used it.

i) Never heard of it ☐

ii) Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it ☐

iii) Have access to it but no time to read it ☐

iv) Have read it and found it to be of no use ☐

Please explain why you found it to be of no use ______________

____

____

17. Have you used the document ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how useful did you find it?

1 poor	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

b) no ☐

If no, please indicate the one best reason why you have not used it.

i) N/A for my level ☐

ii) Never heard of it ☐

iii) Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it ☐

iv) Have access to it but no time to read it ☐

v) Have read it and found it to be of no use ☐

Please explain why you found it to be of no use ____________

____

____

18. Have you used the document ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how useful did you find it?

1	2	3	4	5
poor	fair	good	very good	excellent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

b) no ☐

If no, please indicate the one best reason why you have not used it.

i) N/A for my level ☐

ii) Never heard of it ☐

iii) Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it ☐

iv) Have access to it but no time to read it ☐

v) Have read it and found it to be of no use ☐

Please explain why you found it to be of no use.________________

____

____

19. Have you used the ESL 10 A Course Manual?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how useful did you find it?

1	2	3	4	5
poor	fair	good	very good	excellent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

b) no ☐

If no, please indicate the one best reason why you have not used it.

i) N/A for my level ☐

ii) Never heard of it ☐

iii) Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it ☐

iv) Have access to it but no time to read it ☐

v) Have read it and found it to be of no use ☐

Please explain why you found it to be of no use ____________________
____
____

20. Have you used the ESL 10 B Course Manual?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how useful did you find it?

1	2	3	4	5
poor	fair	good	very good	excellent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

b) no ☐

If no, please indicate the one best reason why you have not used it.

i) N/A for my level ☐

ii) Never heard of it ☐

iii) Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it ☐

iv) Have access to it but no time to read it ☐

v) Have read it and found it to be of no use ☐

Please explain why you found it to be of no use ____________

____

____

21. Have you used the ESL 10 C Course Manual?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how useful did you find it?

1	2	3	4	5
poor	fair	good	very good	excellent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

b) no ☐

If no, please indicate the one best reason why you have not used it.

i) N/A for my level ☐

ii) Never heard of it ☐

iii) Heard of it but don't know how to obtain it ☐

iv) Have access to it but no time to read it ☐

v) Have read it and found it to be of no use ☐

Please explain why you found it to be of no use ________________

____

____

22. What is your **primary** job? Please check the **one** best answer.

a) ESL teacher .... ☐
b) Special Education Teacher .... ☐
c) Teacher .... ☐
d) School Psychologist .... ☐
e) Guidance Counsellor .... ☐

23. Please check the type of school in which you work.

a) N/A .... ☐
b) Elementary .... ☐
c) Elementary-Junior High .... ☐
d) Elementary-Junior/Senior High ..... ☐
e) Junior High .... ☐
f) Senior High .... ☐
g) Junior-Senior High .... ☐
h) Other ☐ (Please describe) ____________________

24. What is the name of your school division?

a) ____________________

b) What is the name of the school where you work?
____

25. Where is this school located? (name of city, town, hamlet, village, colony, or settlement)

____

APPENDIX FOR ESL TEACHERS (ie. teachers who have been assigned some or all of their teaching time with groups of ESL students)

Note: N/A = not applicable

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING "LEVELS OF LANGUAGE COMPETENCE" MAY NOT CORRESPOND PRECISELY TO THOSE WITH WHICH YOU MAY BE FAMILIAR. HOWEVER, PLEASE REFER TO THEM WHEN ANSWERING QUESTION 26.

LEVEL 1 - Students with little or no knowledge of English.

LEVEL 2 - Students with English for survival in informal situations. These students are able to function in basic oral communication situations, but benefit only minimally from regular classroom instruction.

LEVEL 3 - Students with some English for academic purposes. These students are able to function in the classroom situation, but require considerable assistance.

LEVEL 4 - Students almost fully functional in English. These students are able to function in the regular classroom situation with some assistance, but have still not attained a level of language adequate for their grade level.

LEVEL 5 - Students fully functional in English at or above their grade level.

26. In your estimation, how many hours per week do each of the following groups of ESL students receive ESL instruction from you? Please print the **number of hours** for each in the box provided.

a) Level 1 ☐
b) Level 2 ☐
c) Level 3 ☐
d) Level 4 ☐
e) Level 5 ☐

27. Please indicate **how many** of your ESL students **are receiving** the following services. Please use a "0" for "none".

a) Special Education Programs ☐
b) Psychological Services ☐

28. Please indicate **how many** of your ESL students **require** the following services. Please use a "0" for "none".

a) Special Education Programs ☐
b) Psychological Services ☐

29. While under your instruction, approximately how much of the time do students spend learning English as a second language by working in the following subject areas? Please check the **one best** answer for **each** of the alternatives.

	1 almost never	2 not much of the time	3 some of the time	4 most of the time	5 almost all of the time
a) Math	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Social Studies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Language Arts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Music	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Art	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Drama	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i) Physical Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j) Vocational Education (eg. business, carpentry)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

30. Have __any__ of the ESL students that you are teaching at present received more than 3 years of ESL instruction?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If yes;

a) How many students? ☐

b) How many of __those students mentioned in a)__ are now achieving at grade level and __as of June 30, 1988 will require no form of ESL assistance__?. ☐

c) How many of __those students mentioned in (a)__ do you feel will have acquired enough English language skills __as of June 30, 1988 to participate comfortably in social activities__? ☐

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

APPENDIX FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

26. Please indicate the frequency with which the following groups request your assistance with English as a second language students.

	1 never	2 rarely	3 sometimes	4 fairly often	5 frequently
a) Non-English as a Second Language Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) English as a Second Language Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) School Counsellors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) School Psychologists	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Other (Please specify)__	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

27. Are you able to meet the following needs of students who do not speak English as their first language?

a) Special Education Needs yes ☐ no ☐

b) "Gaps" in learning because of missed months or years of schooling yes ☐ no ☐

c) No "Special Education" needs, but do not have enough English to succeed in regular classes yes ☐ no ☐

d) Other (Please specify) ______________ yes ☐ no ☐

____

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

APPENDIX FOR NON-ESL TEACHERS

26. When students who do not speak English as their first language(i.e. ESL), have problems learning general subject matter in your classes, how often do you do the following?

	1 never	2 rarely	3 sometimes	4 fairly often	5 frequently
a) Ask an English/Language Arts teacher for help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Ask an English as a Second Language teacher for help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Ask an English or Language Arts consultant for help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Ask an English as a Second Language consultant for help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Ask a school counsellor for help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Ask a School Psychologist for help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Ask no other person for help. Deal with the students on your own.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

27. Please indicate how many of your students who do not speak English as their first language are receiving the following services. Please use a "0" for "none".

a) Special Education Programs ☐

b) Psychological Services ☐

28. Please indicate how many of your students who do not speak English as their first language require the following services. Please use a "0" for "none".

a) Special Education Programs ☐

b) Psychological Services ☐

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

SCHOOL COUNSELLORS

Please use check marks to answer these questions. You may need to give additional information for some questions. Spaces will be provided in which you should PRINT this information.

Note: ESL = English as a Second Language

1. What is the total number of students that you are working with at present? (Both Non-ESL and ESL combined)

☐

2. Of that total number mentioned in number 1, how many do not speak English as their first language?

☐

3. How many of the ESL students mentioned in number 2 were referred to you for help with social problems?

☐

4. Are you able to help those students mentioned in number 3 with social problems they may have at school?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If no, why not?

____

____

____

5. How many of the ESL students mentioned in number 2 were referred to you for help with academic problems?

☐

6. Are you able to help those students mentioned in number 5 with academic problems they may have at school?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If no, why not?________

____

____

____

7. How many of the ESL students that you are seeing at present (i.e. those mentioned in number 2) were referred to you for help with program counselling?

☐

8. Are you able to help those students mentioned in number 7 with program counselling?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If no, why not?________

____

____

____

9. How many of the ESL students are you seeing at present (i.e. those mentioned in number 2) were referred to you for help with career counselling?

☐

10. Are you able to help those students mentioned in number 9 with career counselling?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If no, why not?________

____

____

____

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

Please use check marks to answer these questions. You may need to give additional information for some questions. Spaces will be provided in which you should PRINT this information.

Note: ESL = English as a Second Language

1. What is the **total number** of students that you are working with at present? (Both Non-ESL and ESL combined)

☐

2. Of that **total number** mentioned in number 1, how many do not speak English as their first language?

☐

3. **How many** of the ESL students **mentioned in number 2** were referred to you for help with social problems?

☐

4. Are you able to help those students **mentioned in number 3** with social problems they may have at school?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If no, why not?

____

____

5. How many of the ESL students mentioned in number 2 that you are seeing at present were referred to you for help with academic problems?

☐

6. Are you able to help those students mentioned in number 5 with academic problems they may have at school?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If no, why not? ____________

____

____

____

7. Are you required to provide ESL assessment services to those students who do not speak English as their first language?

a) yes ☐

If yes, how many have you assessed this year? ☐

b) no ☐

If no, who does the assessing?

a) Nobody ☐

b) ESL teacher ☐

c) Other ☐

____

____

____

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

ESL CONSULTANT

Please use check marks to answer these questions. You may need to give additional information for some questions. Spaces will be provided in which you should PRINT this information.

1. Of all the requests you receive for help, how often do those requests come from each of the following groups? Please check the appropriate box for each group.

	1 never	2 rarely	3 sometimes	4 fairly often	5 frequently
a) ESL teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Special Education Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Non-ESL Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) School Counsellors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) School Psychologists	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Other (Please specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. a) Who is responsible for **assessment and placement** of ESL pupils in the schools you serve?

i) you alone ☐

ii) you and the ESL teachers ☐

iii) School Psychologist ☐

iv) Other (please specify) ☐

____

____

3. Please check the **one** type of curricular support document that you feel is **most** needed for teaching ESL students.

a) ESL program of studies ☐

b) General guidelines and suggestions ☐

c) English as a second language teaching suggestions incorporated into all subject area curriculum guides ☐

d) Other (Please specify) ☐ ________________________

4. Please check off any of the following documents that you recommend to teachers when dealing with ESL students. If you have never recommended any of these documents, make sure that you check "g) NONE".

a) ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs ☐

b) ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions ☐

c) ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions ☐

d) ESL 10 A course manual ☐

e) ESL 10 B course manual ☐

f) ESL 10 C course manual ☐

g) NONE ☐

5. Which **one** of the following groups provides the majority of language support for ESL students in the schools that you serve?

a) ESL teachers ☐

b) Non-ESL teachers ☐

c) Teacher aides ☐

d) Volunteers ☐

e) Others (Please specify) (eg. combinations of the above) ☐

______________________ ☐

______________________ ☐

______________________ ☐

6. Please check the type(s) of school(s) for which you are responsible.

a) Elementary ☐

b) Elementary-Junior High ☐

c) Elementary -Senior High ☐

d) Junior High ☐

e) Senior High ☐

f) Junior-Senior High ☐

g) Other ☐ (Please describe) ______________________________

7. What is the approximate number of ESL students for whom you are responsible?

a) under 100 ☐
b) 100-300 ☐
c) 301-500 ☐
d) 501-700 ☐
e) 701-1000 ☐
f) 1001-1500 ☐
g) over 1500 ☐

8. For **how many schools** are you responsible? ☐

9. What is the name of your **school division**?

____

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS CONSULTANT

Please use check marks to answer these questions. You may need to give additional information for some questions. Spaces will be provided in which you should PRINT this information.

Note: ESL = English as a Second Language

1. **How often** do the following people request your services for help with **ESL students?** Please check the appropriate box for each group.

	1 never	2 rarely	3 sometimes	4 fairly often	5 frequently
a) Non-ESL Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) ESL Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Special Ed. Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) School Psychologists	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) School Counsellors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Other (Please Specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
________________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. On the average, are you able to effectively help teachers who request help with English as a second language?

yes ☐

no ☐

If no, why not?

____

____

____

3. Please check the one type of curricular support document that you feel is **most** needed for teaching ESL students.

a) ESL program of studies ☐

b) General guidelines and suggestions ☐

c) English as a second language teaching suggestions incorporated into all subject area curriculum guides ☐

d) Other (Please specify) ☐ __________________________

4. Which one of the following groups provides the majority of language support to the ESL students in the schools that you serve?

a) ESL teacher ☐

b) Non-ESL teacher ☐

c) Teacher aide ☐

d) Volunteers ☐

e) Others (Please specify) ☐

____________________ ☐

____________________ ☐

____________________ ☐

5. Please check the type of school(s) in which you serve

a) Elementary .... ☐

b) Elementary-Junior High .... ☐

c) Elementary-Junior/Senior High ..... ☐

d) Junior High .... ☐

e) Senior High .... ☐

f) Junior-Senior High .... ☐

g) Other ☐ (Please describe) ______________________________

6. What is the name of your school division?

____

7. For how many schools are you responsible? ☐

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

PRINCIPALS

Please use check marks to answer these questions. You may need to give additional information for some questions. Spaces will be provided in which you should PRINT this information.

Note: ESL = English as a Second Language

1. Please check the type of school in which you work.

   a) Elementary .... ☐
   b) Elementary-Junior High .... ☐
   c) Elementary-Junior/Senior High ..... ☐
   d) Junior High .... ☐
   e) Senior High .... ☐
   f) Junior-Senior High .... ☐
   g) Other (Please describe) ______________________

2. Are the following documents are in your school and available to your staff? Please check the appropriate box..

	yes	no	not sure
a) ESL/D Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs	☐	☐	☐
b) ESL Elementary Guidelines and Suggestions	☐	☐	☐
c) ESL Junior High Guidelines and Suggestions	☐	☐	☐
d) ESL 10 A Course Manual	☐	☐	☐
e) ESL 10 B Course Manual	☐	☐	☐
f) ESL 10 C Course Manual	☐	☐	☐
g) NONE	☐	☐	☐

3. How does your school help students learn English if their first language is not English? Please check the ONE alternative which best describes what is done in your school.

a) ☐ RECEPTION CLASS -These students receive intensive instruction from an English as a second language teacher all day. The students remain with this teacher prior to being placed in regular classes.

b) ☐ PARTIAL DAY CLASS - These students spend part of the day in an English as a second language designated school and the rest of the day in regular classes in a school that is not ESL designated.

c) ☐ WITHDRAWAL PROGRAM: ESL RESOURCE ROOM - These students are withdrawn from regular classes periodically to go to an English as a second language resource room. In regular classes these students are able to take part in subject areas having low language demand, ie. physical education and art.

d) ☐ WITHDRAWAL PROGRAM; ITINERANT TEACHER - The English as a second language teacher travels to schools and withdraws those students who need help.

e) ☐ TRANSITIONAL CLASSES - An English as a second language teacher works with the classroom teachers to partially integrate these students into regular programs (ie. social studies, math etc.) where language and content have been modified.

f) ☐ SUPPORT PROGRAMS WITHIN A REGULAR CLASSROOM -These students remain in regular classrooms. English as second language teachers, consultants, tutors, teacher aides, interpreters, special education teachers,and guidance and counselling personnel, give support to classroom teachers.

g) ☐ BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM - These students receive some instruction in their first language.

h) ☐ Other (Please specify)

____

____

4. Does your school offer English as a Second Language programming?

yes ☐

no ☐

If yes, when was it first started?

a) month ☐

b) year ☐

5. If you **do not** offer ESL programming in your school, which one of the following groups assumes **primary responsibility** for meeting the needs of those students who speak English as a second language?

a) Classroom teachers .... ☐

b) Special Education teachers .... ☐

c) Counsellor .... ☐

d) School Psychologist .... ☐

e) English as a Second Language Teacher ☐

f) Other .... ☐

6. **How many** students in your school are receiving English as a Second Language instruction? (PLEASE GIVE A NUMBER, not a percentage) ☐

7. Of those students mentioned in number 6, for how many do you **receive funding**? ☐

(PLEASE GIVE A NUMBER, not a percentage)

8. Do you have any students in your school who **require** English as a Second Language instruction but are **not funded** and are **not receiving** instruction?

yes ☐

no ☐

If yes, how many students? ☐

9. When a student in your school is eligible for English as a Second Language and Special Education funding, do you receive funding for **both** programs?

a) yes ☐

b) no ☐

If no, for which **program** do you receive the funding?

Special Education ☐

English as a Second Language ☐

10. What is the total enrolment of your school? ☐

11. Please briefly describe the characteristics of the student who would qualify for English as a Second Language instruction in your school. (i.e. How do you define an ESL student?)

____

____

____

____

____

12. What is the name of your school division?

a)____

13. What is the name of your school? ______________________________

14. Where is this school located? (name of city, town, hamlet, village, colony, or settlement)

____

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

SUPERINTENDENTS

Note: ESL = English as a Second Language
Funded/non-funded refers to Provincial funding

1. Please complete the following chart for your school division. Space is provided in the event that you are responsible for more than one division.

Name of School Division	# of Schools	#of Schools with funded ESL programs	# of Schools with non-funded ESL programs	# of ESL Consultants	# of ESL Teachers	# of funded students receiving ESL instruction	# of non-funded students receivinc ESL instruction
i)________							
ii)________							
iii)________							
iv)________							
v)________							

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WHICH YOU FEEL MAY BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA EDUCATION IN PROVIDING PROGRAM SERVICES FOR ESL STUDENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP

Appendix H

Copy of May 3, Pre-questionnaire Letter

Alberta
EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L2

May 3, 1988

SUBJECT: ESL NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

You have been selected to participate in a study assessing the needs of students requiring English as a second language instruction. Your participation in this survey will provide to Alberta Education valuable information regarding curricular program needs for ESL students.

You will receive a questionnaire within the next two weeks. You are requested to complete the survey questionnaire by May 20, 1988. The questionnaire will take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time.

Even if you have no ESL students in your class you are encouraged to respond and take the opportunity to express your views and concerns. Your input will have an impact on ESL education in the province.

Kathryn L. Hunt
Kathy Hunt
ESL Consultant

Diane Wyllie
Diane Wyllie
ESL Consultant

EVH/by

Appendix I

Copy of May 13 Letter, Questionnaire Letter

Alberta
EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L2

May 13, 1988

Dear Participant,

On May 3, 1988 a letter was sent to you informing you that you have been chosen to be a respondent in an ESL needs assessment survey. The purpose of this province wide survey is to gather information from educators which will aid in program planning for English as a second language.

The survey will take you approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Most of your responses will require only check marks. Space is provided for your comments. We welcome any additional thoughts or suggestions you may wish to share.

The survey will be sent to both ESL and NON-ESL school personnel. Your participation is vital to the success of this survey! Your responses, together with those of other Alberta teachers, superintendents, and consultants will provide an accurate representation of the entire survey population.

The information that you provide will be confidential. Your questionnaire will be identified by a serial number and your anonymity is guaranteed.

The survey results will be analyzed and a report will be prepared by Alberta Education containing suggestions and recommendations for future ESL programming.

Once you have completed the questionnaire, return it in the self addressed, stamped envelope by Wednesday, May 25, 1988.

Your participation is important to this study. Please use this opportunity to express your concerns. If you have any questions please call us at 433-7671.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathryn L. Hunt
Kathryn Hunt
ESL Consultant

Diane Wyllie
Diane Wyllie
ESL Consultant

Appendix J

Copy of June 6 Letter, Follow-up #1

Alberta
EDUCATION
Devonian Building, West Tower, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L2

June 6, 1988

Dear Participant:

On May 13, 1988 a questionnaire surveying ESL in the province was sent to you. If you have completed and returned the questionnaire, thank you for your cooperation.

If you have not yet completed the questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible and return it to:

D. Wyllie and K. Hunt
C/O Dr. Douglas Parker
Department of Secondary Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

Once again, thank you for your participation in this study. Your input is very important for the final report.

If you have any questions please call us at 433-7671.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathryn L. Hunt
Kathryn Hunt

Diane Wyllie
Diane Wyllie

Appendix K

Copy of June 10 Letter, Follow-up #2

Alberta
EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L2

June 10, 1988

RE: ESL NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

In May a questionnaire regarding an ESL Needs Assessment from Alberta Education was sent to you. We have not yet received your response. If you have recently completed and returned the questionnaire, thank you for your cooperation. In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, we have enclosed another copy for you to complete.

Your prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kathryn L. Hunt

Kathryn Hunt
ESL Consultant
Language Services Branch

Diane Wyllie

Diane Wyllie
ESL Consultant
Language Services Branch

/vz
encl

Appendix L

Table L-1, Categories of School where ESL Consultants Indicate some Responsibility

Table L-1

Categories of School for which ESL Consultants have some Responsibility

Category of School	% Consultants Indicating that their Responsibility Includes the Category
Elementary	100
Junior High	90
Senior High	90

Note: The sample group from which this data were collected was relatively small which accounts for the high percentages.